

The Christian East

LETTER FROM ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY TO PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE

March 4, 1920.

TO the Most Reverend, the Lord Dorotheos, by the Divine Grace, Metropolitan of Brousa, and *locum tenens* of the Sacred Œcumenical Throne of Constantinople, greeting in Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour.

MOST REVEREND AND DEAR BROTHER,

It has been our privilege during the last few years to welcome certain eminent representatives of the Holy Eastern Orthodox Church who have come to London on matters of great importance. I have myself had the pleasure of receiving His Beatitude the Archbishop of Cyprus, His Holiness the Metropolitan of Athens, His Holiness the Metropolitan of Trebizond, and other distinguished Bishops and theologians, in Lambeth Palace, and I shall not easily forget our conversations together on these occasions.

Besides this, advantage has been taken of the opportunity which the presence of such illustrious Orthodox ecclesiastics has provided for the holding of conferences between Bishops and theologians of the Greek Orthodox Church and Bishops and theologians of the Church of England, both at Oxford and in London. These conferences, which dealt with weighty matters of the Faith and Order of the Church of Christ, have proved of very great value—certainly to ourselves—for there are few things which help more to mutual understanding than mutual conversation and mutual intercourse.

In the month of July, 1920, there will be held at Lambeth Palace a great assembly of Bishops, known as the Lambeth Conference, to which all the Bishops of the Anglican Communion are invited from all parts of the world, and from all the Churches in communion with the Church of England. The Conference is held every ten years, though now, owing to the great upheaval of the world war, twelve years have passed since the last Lambeth Conference took place. At the forthcoming Lambeth Conference we expect some 300 Archbishops, Metropolitans, and Bishops, who will be assembled together in common

prayer and council for a period of five weeks, concluding with a great Service of Thanksgiving in St. Paul's Cathedral. We shall deliberate together concerning the needs of our Communion and of the world in this time of stress. The subject which will hold the foremost place in our discussions is the subject of Christian Unity.

In dealing with that great subject we must give a prominent place to the relation which the Church of England bears to the Orthodox Church of the East. It would, therefore, be particularly valuable if Your Beatitude (if this were possible) or Your Beatitude's representative, as a delegate from the Holy Synod of the Church of Constantinople, were able to be present in London for some days at least during the time when this grave matter is under consideration. This would give the Bishops of the Anglican Communion the happy privilege of welcoming such delegate in some special way. If it would be helpful to Your Beatitude or such delegate that some learned scholar or doctor of your Church should accompany him, it would add weight to the deliberations.

I, therefore, commend this invitation to the consideration of Your Beatitude, and trust that I may learn from you that you are willing to further our purpose.

Praying therefore earnestly in the spirit for the unity of all men in the Faith of the Gospel, as expounded by the Œcumenical Councils of the undivided Church of Christ and in the living knowledge of the Son of God,

I am,

Your Beatitude's most faithful and devoted Servant and
Brother in Our Lord Jesus Christ,

RANDALL CANTUAR.

LETTER FROM CONSTANTINOPLE

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY has received the following letter from the *locum tenens* of the Œcumenical Patriarchate, Constantinople:

UNTO ALL THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST
WHERESOEVER THEY BE

"See that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently" (1 Pet. i. 22).

Our Church is of opinion that a closer intercourse with each other and a mutual understanding between the several Christian Churches is not prevented by the doctrinal differences existing between them, and that such an understanding is highly desirable and necessary, and in many ways useful in the well-conceived interest of each one of the

Churches taken apart and of the whole Christian body, as also for preparing and facilitating the complete and blessed union which may some day be attained with God's help. Our Church, therefore, deems the present time most opportune for bringing forth and considering in common this important question. For although, owing to old prejudices, traditions, and even pretensions, it is probable that there may even now arise or be brought forward the same difficulties which had so often frustrated the work of union, nevertheless, seeing that it is now question for a mere contact and understanding, the difficulties, in our mind, will in any case be less serious, and if there be a good will and disposition, neither can they nor ought to constitute an invincible and insuperable obstacle.

We therefore on the establishment of the League of Nations, which has now been effected with good omen, consider the matter to be both feasible and more than ever timely, and we beg, full of hope, to herein state summarily our thoughts and opinion as to how we conceive this intercourse and understanding, and how do we consider it possible, and we earnestly seek and invite the judgment and opinion thereon both of the other brothers in the East and of the venerable Christian Churches in the West, wheresoever they be.

We accordingly think that the following two things can most greatly contribute to the attainment of such a desirable and useful intercourse, and to its accomplishment and public manifestation :

And first of all we deem as necessary and indispensable the removal of all mutual distrust and friction between the various Churches caused by the tendency, to be seen among some of them, of enticing and converting followers of other confessions. For no one ignores what is taking place, unfortunately, even now disturbing the internal peace of the Churches, and especially of those in the East, on which new afflictions and trials are thus brought through their own co-religionists; and how great, as compared with the trifling results obtained, is the hatred and antagonism produced by this tendency on the part of some to proselyte and entice the followers of other Christian confessions.

And thus sincerity and, above all, confidence being once restored as between the Churches, we consider as the most important thing that love between the Churches must be revived and strengthened, so that they may no longer look upon each other as strangers and enemies, but as relatives and friends in Christ, and as "fellow-heirs and of the same body and partakers of His promise in Christ by the Gospel" (Eph. iii. 6). And when the several Churches are inspired by love, and place it before everything else in their judgment of the others and in relation towards each other, they then will be able, instead of increasing and widening the existing dissensions, to lessen and diminish the same as far as possible ; and by promoting a constant brotherly interest

in the condition, the stability, and the prosperity of the other Churches, by their eagerness in watching what is happening in those Churches, and by obtaining a more accurate knowledge of them, and by their readiness to give, whenever occasion arises, a hand of help and assistance, they then will do and achieve many good things to the glory and profit both of themselves and of the whole Christian body, and to the advance of the matter of the union.

And this friendship and kindly disposition towards each other can, to our mind, be demonstrated and more especially proved in the following manner: (a) By the acceptance of a uniform calendar, for the simultaneous celebration of all the great Christian feasts by all the Churches; (b) by the exchange of brotherly letters on the great feasts of the ecclesiastical year, when it is customary so to do, and on other exceptional occasions; (c) by a more friendly intercourse between the representatives of the various Churches wherever they be; (d) by an intercourse between theological schools and the representatives of theological science, and by the exchange of the theological and ecclesiastical periodicals and works published in each Church; (e) by the exchange of students between the seminaries of the different Churches; (f) by convening pan-Christian conferences to examine questions of a common interest to all the Churches; (g) by the impartial and in a more historical way examination of the doctrinal differences both from the chair and in theological treatises; (h) by mutually respecting the customs and usages prevailing in each Church; (i) by allowing to each other the use of places of prayer and of cemeteries for the funeral and burial of persons belonging to other confessions dying in foreign lands; (j) by the settlement of the question of mixed marriages between the various confessions; (k) and, finally, by the mutual support of the Churches in the work of strengthening religious belief, of charity, and the like.

Such a frank and vivid intercourse between the Churches will be all the more beneficial to the whole body of the Church, as many dangers threaten no longer any particular Church, but all of them generally, because these dangers attack the very foundations of the Christian faith and the very composition of Christian life and society. For the terrible world war which has just come to an end, as it has brought to light many unhealthy things in the life of Christian nations, and revealed in many cases a great absence of respect for the very principles of justice and humanity, so, too, it has not only made the old wounds worse, but, so to speak, opened new ones of a more practical character, and against which great attention and care is naturally needed on the part of all the Churches. The daily gaining ground of alcoholism; the increase of superfluous luxury under the pretext of rendering life more beautiful and more enjoyable; the

voluptuousness and lust hardly covered by the cloak of freedom and emancipation of the flesh; the prevailing unchecked licentious indecency in literature, painting, the theatre, and in music, bearing the respectable name of development of good taste and cultivation of fine arts; the deification of wealth, and the contempt of higher ideals: all these and the like, as they produce serious dangers to the constitution of Christian societies, are questions of the day, requiring and calling for a common study and co-operation on the part of the Christian Churches.

Finally, it is the duty of the Churches which adorn themselves with the sacred name of Christ not to forget and neglect any longer His new and great commandment of love, and still to remain behind piteously of the political authorities, which, applying truly the spirit of the Gospel and of the justice of Christ, have already instituted under happy auspices the League of Nations, for the defence of right and the cultivation of love and harmony among nations.

For all these reasons we, hoping that the other Churches would share our thoughts and opinion as above stated on the need of promoting, at least for the beginning, such a co-operation and intercourse between the Churches, request each one of them to make known to us in reply its thoughts and opinion thereon, so that after defining by common consent and in agreement the object, we may safely proceed in common to its realization, and thus "speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ: from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love" (Eph. iv. 16).

At the Patriarchate of Constantinople in the month of January, in the year of Grace one thousand nine hundred and twenty.

The *locum tenens* of the Patriarchal (Ecumenical) Throne:

Metropolitan of Brussa: DOROTHEUS.

The Metropolitan of Caesaria: NICOLAUS.

"	"	Cyzicus: CONSTANTINUS.
"	"	Amassia: GERMANUS.
"	"	Pissidia: GERASSIMUS.
"	"	Angyra: GERVASIUS.
"	"	Aenos: JOACHIM.
"	"	Vizya: ANTHIMUS.
"	"	Silivria: EUGENIUS.
"	"	Saranta Ecclesiae: AGATHANGELUS.
"	"	Tyrolæ and Serentium: CHRYSOSTOM.
"	"	Dardanelles and Lampsacos: EIRINAIUS.

COMMITTEE ON OUR RELATIONS WITH THE EASTERN CHURCHES, ORTHODOX AND SEPARATED. APPOINTED BY THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

BY THE RIGHT REV. BISHOP GORE

THE Archbishop of Canterbury at the end of last year appointed an influential Committee to deal with the large group of interests described as "our relations with the Eastern Churches"—a Committee which may be said really to comprise almost all our experts in this group of subjects; and more recently the *locum tenens* of the Patriarchal Throne has appointed a corresponding Committee at Constantinople to represent the Orthodox Church. Moreover, he has been invited, and has accepted the invitation, to send a delegation to confer with the bishops to be assembled this summer in the Lambeth Conference. Similar Committees exist in Athens and Belgrade. Such facts as these invite serious attention. We all know that since the seventeenth century the idea has haunted Anglican minds from time to time that there should be much less difficulty in bringing the Anglican Churches back into fellowship and unity with the Eastern and Orthodox Churches than in effecting a similar reconciliation with the Roman Catholic Church. I need not now go back upon the older or more recent attempts to realize the hope. But undoubtedly the events of the war have given us a quite fresh opportunity. Let us enumerate some of these events. The first Russian Revolution led to the re-establishment of the Patriarchate of Moscow and the emancipation of the Russian Synod. There appeared to be good hopes of a new spirit in those who were directing the counsels of the great Russian Church. And we still await with the liveliest interest the re-emergence of that suffering Church from its late awful experiences. Again, owing to the presence in England of the Serbian refugees, especially the theological students, and amongst them of leaders, such as our dear friend, Nicholas Velimirović, now Bishop of Žiča, our relations with the Serbian Church have become much more intimate. Again, the new Archbishop of Athens, Meletius, has been with us, full of new ideals and hopes, and the Archbishop of Trebizond, who, I think, impressed all of us with his wisdom and goodness. I am mentioning only those among our visitors with whom I have been brought into personal relations. Others were mentioned in the last number of the CHRISTIAN EAST. Besides these prelates, we have had a wonderful woman amongst us, the sister of the hereditary Catholicos of the Assyrian Church—that remnant for which "the Archbishop's Mission"

laboured for so many years, so patiently and silently, but with such good and enduring fruit. As an outcome of the work of the Mission, we have had our conviction deepened that the Assyrian Church is not in any real sense Nestorian, but really shares the faith of the Councils in everything but name. And we recall the friendly and brotherly attitude of Athanasius towards those semi-Arians who declined the phrase *homoousion* indeed, but who, he says, "really hold the same faith as we do, differing only in the name." Again, we have had remarkable men amongst us, representing the Armenian Church—the Church of that nation which has endured and is enduring such unspeakable outrages and persecutions—both the Constantinopolitan Patriarch and the Archbishop of Erivan together with Archbishop Barsaüm of Syria, whose people have lost by massacre perhaps more in proportion than all others. With all these we have had opportunities of conference, in groups or individually. Some of them, perhaps, in their English surroundings and under the influence of friendly fellowship we have found more agreeable to our desires for reunion than we should find the Church they represent in formal conference. We do not underrate the difficulties (theological, sacramental, and historical) which present serious obstacles to reunion. But we are sure the opportunity of the present moment is great, and that we must be eager to take advantage of it.

We do not believe that at the present moment the chief obstacles to reunion would be found in the purely theological ground. We think they are gravest on the ground of sacramental doctrine. Our XXVth Article seems to the Eastern to deny that Holy Order is a Sacrament of the Gospel. This awkward Article obscures what is really the plain witness of our services of Ordination. Nothing would pave the way towards reunion so much as a clear statement by such an authority as our Convocations, or even the Lambeth Conference—though that is a conference and not a synod—that, in fact, while affirming with the Fathers the supremacy of the two great Sacraments, which the Gospels record that our Lord formally instituted on earth, yet we do undoubtedly, as our Ordinal shows, hold Ordination for a sacrament—that is, for an outward and visible instrument of a special Divine gift of grace for ministry, given in differing grades of completeness to the different orders of ministry; and, I may add, that we hold a corresponding belief about Confirmation, as has been admirably set forth on grounds of Scripture by the present Bishop of Ely.

I have sought to indicate the importance of the present opportunity, and I have indicated the kind of ways in which we might take advantage of it. On the other side, on the side of the Easterns, I have no doubt that their experience is suggesting the need for a reconsideration of many points in their traditional system. On both sides approach

might be made easier without any breach with the substance or principles of the sacred tradition. But it must be quite obvious that to take advantage of the opportunity will involve much work on both sides, and in particular will lay no slight burden upon the Archbishop's Committee, not least in this present year of the Lambeth Conference. Accordingly, I have been very glad to avail myself of the opportunity offered me by the Editor of this new magazine, established to further the cause of mutual knowledge and better relations between the Eastern and Anglican Churches, to interest Church people in the work of our Committee, of which the Archbishop has made me Chairman. We want their earnest prayers for guidance and strength in our work. And, inasmuch as we have no obvious source of supplies except private liberality, while it is obvious that the payment of a stipend to our energetic Secretary, Mr. Fynes-Clyton, and to a clerk, and the rent of a humble office, with attendant expenses, will require an income of some six or seven hundred pounds, I am not ashamed to ask our friends to send a contribution for the needs of our work to the Treasurer, Lieut.-Colonel Sir Samuel Hoare, Bart., C.M.G., M.P., 27, Finsbury Square, E.C. 2.

THE RELATIONS OF THE CONSTANTINOPOLITAN AND ANGLICAN CHURCHES

[The following article has been translated from the Greek. It appeared in the *Ecclesiastical Aletheia*, the official organ of the Great Church of Constantinople, October, 1919.—ED.]

WE print below a report sent by the Right Reverend the Metropolitan of Trebizond, Mgr. Chrysanthos, to the Locum Tenens of the Patriarchal Throne of Constantinople, and the Holy Synod of the Œcumenical Patriarchate. This report well illustrates the manner in which the relations between the two Churches have been renewed and confirmed, and shows the sympathy and affection sincerely felt on both sides. The report further indicates the necessity of bringing the precious traditions of our Church into closer harmony with contemporary life, and stimulating through such a harmonious co-ordination alike our ecclesiastical, religious, and social life.

"RIGHT REVEREND BROTHER,

"His Grace, the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, in answer to an appeal sent to the Primate of the Church of England in the course of June last, by the Right Reverend the Locum Tenens of the

Œcumenical Throne, at that time residing in Paris, addressed a most cordial letter of sympathy and encouragement to the long-suffering Church of Constantinople. The Right Reverend the Locum Tenens had by that time left Paris, and it was decided accordingly that I should proceed from Paris to London, so as personally to convey to His Grace, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the thanks of our Church for his kind letter and generous encouragement, and further express our hope that the interest hitherto shown on behalf of the unredeemed Christian populations of the Near East by the Anglican Church and the mighty British Empire may continue undiminished.

"Accordingly on the 10th (23rd) of July last, I left for London. His Grace, the Archbishop of Canterbury, on learning of my arrival from a letter which I wrote to him, immediately sent to convey to me his greetings Mr. Athelstan Riley, a member of the House of Laymen of the Diocese of Canterbury, and a personal friend of His Grace, and Father Fynes-Clinton. Both of these gentlemen are full of a reverent admiration for the ancient Church of Byzantium. Having called on me, they informed me that His Grace would receive me at Lambeth Palace on the day he returned from the country, and further arranged the programme of the visits I was to make to various Anglican churches. Mr. Riley put his own motor-car at my disposal for this purpose.

"Accordingly, on the morning of Sunday, July 14th (27th), I attended the service at the Church of St. Augustine, Kilburn. The Bishop of Nassau officiated, and a special throne had been prepared for me in the chancel. The service was performed admirably, and I was touched at the piety of the Anglican congregation who bowed as I went out, and waited for the blessing of the representative of the Church of Byzantium.

"Accompanied by Mr. Riley and Father Clinton, I proceeded after the service to the Convent of the Sisters of the Church. I was received by the Mother Superior, who showed me over the different parts of the convent. The convent in question occupies itself with the education and upbringing of poor orphans, thus bringing the monastic theory into line with the actualities of life. In this way it avoids that development of monastic egotism which appears to be inevitable when monastic life is exclusively contemplative. More than that, it actually develops the feeling of love for one's neighbours and, in particular, the affection which ought always to be the indelible characteristic of a woman's soul. Shortly after noon luncheon was offered me in the convent, and when it was over, at the request of the Mother Superior, I read out a prayer of absolution to the Sisters who had assembled in the chapel of the convent.

"Immediately afterwards I visited another convent. Here the Sisters devote themselves to the care of the sick and the training of

nurses.¹ I was greatly impressed by the affection and self-denial with which the Sisters tend the sick, and seek to inspire them with courage and hope.

"On the evening of the same Sunday I was invited to attend the service at All Saints' Church, Margaret Street. The church was full. I was received by the Bishop of Nassau and the late Bishop of Oxford, Dr. Gore, a learned theologian who has resigned his see in order to devote himself exclusively to theological study. As I entered the church an excellent choir of men and boys sang the "Eis polla eti, despota" beautifully in the original Greek. After Vespers, a confirmation service was held. The Bishop of Nassau confirmed the lads and preached the sermon. Among those present at this impressive ceremony was His Excellency, M. Caclamanos, the Greek Minister, who throughout my stay in London gave me most valuable assistance in my work.

"After the service I was taken to the Presbytery, where I had a long conversation on various topics with Dr. Gore. I was greatly struck by his keen political insight. We also spoke of the reunion of the two Churches, and I found in Dr. Gore yet another friend of our Church and admirer of its traditions.

"On Monday, July 15th (28th), I visited, in Mr. Riley's company, another very interesting convent, which devotes itself to the reformation of fallen women. These women are collected by the chaplains of the convent and by special parish committees of ladies. The Mother Superior, a very able and competent person, courteously gave me valuable information during the two hours of my visit in connection with the symptoms of the inmates and the methods of treatment adopted. I left her with the impression that the work she had in hand was an extremely arduous one, demanding such patience and perseverance as only English women can show. The principal occupations of the inmates are gardening, laundry-work, and sewing.

"In the chapel of the convent the sisters and inmates sang a hymn, after which I read out a prayer of absolution.²

"On the evening of the same day I attended evening service at the magnificent Cathedral Church of St. Paul's, where I was cordially received by Canon Simpson, who on the previous day had delivered an excellent lecture on St. Sophia.

"On Tuesday, July 16th (29th), I visited the House of Lords in the company of Father Clinton. I was kindly shown over the various parts of the house and the library by a bishop³ whom we met there.

"In the afternoon of the same day I called, with Mr. Riley and Mr. Gennadius, the Honorary Greek Minister in London, on His

¹ The convent referred to is the Convent of St. Peter's, Kilburn.

² The convent referred to is St. James' Home, Fulham.

³ The Bishop of Coventry.

Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, who had now returned to Lambeth Palace from the country. At the gate I was received by the Archbishop's secretary and a professor of theology, who conducted me to the office of His Grace. I was there most cordially welcomed by the Archbishop, with whom I exchanged the kiss of peace. I thanked him on behalf of the Œcumenical Patriarchate for the answer he had been good enough to send to the letter of the Right Reverend the Locum Tenens, and I assured him of the encouragement afforded by his letter to the Constantinopolitan Church, which, even after the Armistice, has still to fight a hard fight. Finally, I expressed the hope that this communion of mind and heart between the two Churches may continue, and be crowned by the proclamation of their happy reunion in the Temple of the Holy Wisdom. His Grace, in replying, thanked me for my visit, and gave expression to the affection felt by the Church of England for the ancient Church of Constantinople. He also inquired with great interest about the condition of the Christian population of Turkey, and expressed his fraternal sympathy with the Constantinopolitan Church in her trials and afflictions. I begged him to continue to show in the future the same solicitude as he and the entire Anglican Church had shown in the past on behalf of the Christians of the Near East, and not to relax his efforts in their cause. After this His Grace showed me over the archiepiscopal library.

"Then we parted, after once more exchanging the kiss of peace, and after I had yet again thanked this learned and most excellent prelate and true Christian knight for his warm welcome, and the sympathy and encouragement he had been good enough to convey through me to the Constantinopolitan Church.

"On Wednesday, July 17th (30th), I visited the British Museum with Mr. Riley. I was there received by the keeper, who showed me the various antiquities preserved in the museum. I saw there, occupying the place of honour, unrivalled relics of Hellenic art, and in particular the fragments of the frieze of the Parthenon. Subsequently I visited the offices of the British and Foreign Bible Society. The director of this institution was good enough to present me with copies of certain artistic editions of the Holy Scriptures.

"At three o'clock in the afternoon I attended the service at the historic church of Westminster Abbey—a veritable masterpiece of Gothic architecture. After the service I was taken over this magnificent church and shown the tombs of the great men who have enriched the history of the British nation and made England glorious among nations.

"At five o'clock I called on the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of London, who received me most courteously.

"At eight o'clock that evening I proceeded, on the kind invitation of Mr. Riley, to the latter's house, where an informal conference was held, attended by a number of theologians and clergymen, including a representative of His Grace, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Mr. Gennadius, the honorary Greek Minister, the Serbian Chargé d'Affaires, and a Serb Deacon, and representatives of the British and Greek Press. Mr. Riley spoke first, and gave expression to the joy felt by all there at the presence in their midst of a prelate of the Church of Constantinople. He said that the initiative in the matter of the reunion of the Churches had come from the Church of England, which felt the necessity of strengthening her Catholic and Apostolic traditions through closer communion with the Orthodox Church, and of obtaining, if possible, a recognition by the latter of the validity of Anglican Orders contested by the Roman Church. On the part of the Orthodox Church, he added, there is a tendency to extend such a recognition as is proved by the pronouncement of the Russian theologian, I. Sokoloff. Previous to the war, however, the Orthodox Church, while welcoming all attempts to promote closer relations, had always relegated reunion to a more or less distant future. The war had enormously accelerated the march of events. A proof of this was the fact that the Church of Serbia, which before the war was opposed to the idea, had during the war decided to allow thirty Serb theological students to carry on their studies in Oxford under Anglican supervision. Another proof was afforded by the success of the four theological conferences held on the occasion of the visit of the Right Reverend the Metropolitan of Athens to the United States and England.

"Father Clinton added that the Church of Rumania had also decided to send Rumanian students to England very shortly. Mr. Riley thereupon remarked that while formerly there had been a tendency for Orthodox theologians to proceed to Germany for the purpose of completing their studies, as, for instance, was the case with the Metropolitan of Trebizond himself, they now preferred to come to England.

"I answered briefly, thanking the speakers for their words of sympathy for our Church and emphasizing the merit of the Church of England, which in the midst of the religious convulsions of Europe had succeeded in preserving so many of her traditions, while successfully bringing them into line with the requirements of modern life, thus securing that harmonious balance which is indispensable for all manifestations of life, and, above all, religious and ecclesiastical life, which the ancient Greeks held to be the mother and source of all creative activity. I instanced monastic life, which in England is in admirable harmony with the needs of contemporary society, while with us tradition perhaps weighs more than the actualities of modern life. I remarked that a stronger feeling for tradition in the Anglican Church

and a stronger feeling for the actualities of contemporary religious and ecclesiastical life in our own Church would bring the two Churches nearer to one another.

"Finally, I expressed my opinion that good-will on both sides, a broad-minded view of the matter, and the avoidance of all controversy on trivial points, would bring the Churches into a yet closer relation, on condition always that both were allowed to retain the individual characteristics impressed on them by the very genius and life of the two nations.

"The representative of the Archbishop of Canterbury then stated that the bishops of the American Episcopalian Church, who had recently visited the Near East, had pronounced that everything was ready for the reunion of the two Churches, and had given it as their opinion that a formal proposal to the effect made by the Anglican Church would suffice to bring it about.

"He asked me for my opinion in the matter, and I replied that before such a proposal was actually made it would be better to make further preparations, otherwise one or other of the Churches might be reluctantly compelled, before giving a final answer, to ask for further explanations on the points which separate the two Churches, and such a hesitation might well create a certain coolness between the two Churches. The preparation necessary could be effected through reciprocal visits of representatives of the two Churches and further exchanges of views.

"I remarked that on the occasion of the visit of the Right Reverend the Metropolitan of Athens to London, a formal conference had been held at which the question of the reunion of the Churches had been discussed at length, and I suggested that the minutes of that conference should be published so as to be available for the committee instituted by the Patriarchate for the promotion of closer relations between the two Churches. This suggestion was generally approved. I added that I had not spoken in any official capacity, but had only expressed a personal opinion throughout. This informal conference continued till midnight. After taking leave of my courteous interlocutors, I was conducted by Mr. Riley to his private chapel and there shown a door fashioned by monks of Mount Athos. Mr. Riley visited Mount Athos many years ago in the company of Mgr. Philotheos, Metropolitan of Xanthi and Kavala, and is a warm admirer of our Church. He expressed the hope that it might succeed in preserving its traditions unimpaired, including the celibacy of its bishops, as experience has convinced him that marriage is often a hindrance to bishops in the prosecution of their work. He added that it was his intention to publish a special treatise on this very subject.

THE CHRISTIAN EAST

"Next day, July 18th (31st), I visited a Church Mission¹ in the company of Father Clinton. This Mission has been instituted for the purpose of promoting the intellectual and moral education of working men and women and their children. It includes a library, a reading-room, a chapel, a concert-room, and a refreshments room. The Mission also organizes excursions and sports. In this way the faculties of the working-man are developed in a wholesome way, and he is not allowed to waste his time and ruin his morale in taverns and similar haunts. The Mission also has a kitchen for feeding children of unemployed workmen and children whose mothers are prevented by their work from cooking at home.

"I was informed that English students of theology work at these Missions after taking their degrees at Oxford, as also do the Serb students during vacations. Our own students alone have hitherto failed to visit these most valuable social institutions.

"The remainder of my time in London was devoted to the other mission with which I had been entrusted, and I left for Paris on July 22nd (August 4th).

"On my return to Paris I addressed the following letter in French to His Grace the Bishop of Canterbury, under date of July 26th (August 8th), 1919:

" 'RIGHT REVEREND AND DEARLY BELOVED BROTHER IN CHRIST,

" 'Deeply touched by your cordial welcome, I would express to you once more my warm gratitude.

" 'I left London full of admiration for the Anglican Church, of which you are so distinguished an ornament. Your Grace well knows how to inspire the Christian ideal into the English people who, led by their Church, have turned ideals into realities, and live the truly Christian life.'

"His Grace answered me by a letter in English, under date of August 5th (18th), 1919.

"In this way communion has been renewed with our sister Church of England, and I humbly submit, as my opinion, that this intercourse should be continued through exchanges of letters and visits, and should be consolidated by the presence in London of a permanent representative of our Church, if possible a bishop. Such a representative should have the intellectual, moral, and personal qualifications necessary for maintaining unimpaired the prestige of the Constantinopolitan Church, which the Church of England regards with great reverence and admiration. I also feel that greater care should be

¹ Oxford House, Bethnal Green.

exercised in the choice of the Greek students to be sent to Oxford University, and that these should be instructed to conform with the regulations of college life, and, further, frequent, for the purpose of practical training, the magnificent institutions established by the Anglican Church in connection with charitable and social work. From the latter our own Church has much to learn, and should assimilate everything in them that it is possible for her to assimilate, while taking care to adapt them in the manner best suited to Greek ecclesiastical life.

"I remain, with Christian love,

"Your most humble brother in Christ,

"CHRYSANTHOS.

"Metropolitan of Trebizond."

"PHANAR,

"16th October, 1919.

THE IMPORTANCE OF ST. SOPHIA

BY THE REV. J. A. DOUGLAS

AT the start of our campaign last year for the redemption of St. Sophia, a prominent member of the Asquith Cabinet inveighed testily against it. "Are there no slums in England," he asked, "that you go about to turn things upside down for the sake of a church?" That is the way in which most educated Englishmen look at the St. Sophia question. They may scout the whole business as a piece of ecclesiasticism, or demand that the desecration of the most glorious of all Christian monuments should cease, but to their minds the discussion is over a building and nothing more.

In fact, the future of the great church is of relatively small importance, because of its incomparable beauty, antiquity, and romance, but of world-wide importance because—

(1) So long as it is usurped as a mosque the Turk will continue to live in a world which allows the full rights of men only to Moslems, and has no real room for his Greek and Armenian *rayah*.

(2) Its retrocession to the Œcumenical Patriarch will bind the nations of Eastern Orthodoxy together in a solidarity which will transcend the racial animosities created or intensified in the Balkans by the jealous politics of Europe.

St. Sophia can be of positive value only to that Eastern Orthodox Communion which is practically identical with Eastern Christendom, and of which, in Gibbon's phrase, it is the metropolis. The Turk

desires to retain it, and the Papacy claims it less to use it than to keep the Eastern Christian out of it.

To appreciate the issue we must remember that by its theory the Roman Empire was divine and eternal, the one and only œcumenical state. It identified itself with civilization and inherently claimed the mission to bring the rest of the world into its system. As such it was not tied to any centre. "Wherever the Emperor is, there is Rome," writes Herodian. Its symbol was the Cæsar Augustus, who was the vicegerent of heaven. None the less it needed a symbolic mother-city. When Constantine arrested its decadence by inoculating its degenerate Paganism with the fresh vigour and ideals of Christianity, he made no change in its form and function. All that happened was that the Church entered into possession of the inheritance for which she had confidently waited through her persecution. The Rome of the eternal and divine idea persisted. The Church simply identified herself with it. Cæsar (noster Cæsar, as Tertullian had claimed him in his paganism) knew himself as Christ's vicegerent. The kingdom of the earth had become the kingdom of the Lord.

The transformation, however, required a new symbolic metropolis. Old Rome was the immemorial mother of paganism, and required centuries of squalor and insignificance before it could be purged of heathendom. Moreover, the centre of gravity for Christianity lay in the Greek lands. Constantine had the vision of the great empire builder, and saw the necessities of the case. Accordingly he left Old Rome as incurably pagan, and somewhere between A.D. 325 and 330 founded as New Rome the city which by general consent the world at once insisted on calling after him.

Many things made Constantinople great. Greek life soon centred in it. It became the heart and head of Hellenism. Its unique natural advantages made it the capital of Mediterranean trade, and gave it Egypt, Syria, Asia Minor, and South Italy for its homelands. Old Rome was its appanage; its prestige and riches were enormous. It was *par excellence* the world's great city of intellectuality, of commerce, of government, of pleasure, and of military power for nine centuries. But its supreme characteristic was religious. It was the metropolis of Christendom. The hordes of barbarians which submerged the West never dreamed of subverting its œcumenical order. As they settled down and came into the orbit of its civilization, their rulers were eager to receive from the far-away Roman Basileus, who could not have sent a single power against them, the insignia of kingship, a crown or a robe bearing his eikon as an emblem of his suzerainty. They felt that to have validity their rule must be hall-marked by the ruler of Christendom.

Now, if Constantinople was thus the symbolic mother-city of

Christendom, St. Sophia was the symbolic queen and mother-church of Constantinople, and that, not by accident, but by Constantine's design.

Old Byzantium had stood upon the truncated apex of the triangle of land bounded by the Marmora and Golden Horn. When Constantine swept it away he reserved the whole of its acropolis, consisting of two hardly distinguishable hills, for the imperial buildings in which the majesty of Cæsar should function. Rising up from the Marmora he began that sacred palace which was reproduced in the Kremlin, and a city within a city was for seven hundred years the residence of his successors.

But on the highest part of the hills he founded the two churches, St. Sophia and St. Eirene; or rather ~~the~~ ^{one} church, for although separate fabrics, they had a common enclosure and were always reckoned a single shrine—which, after the rebuildings and drama of sixteen centuries, still are the salient landmarks of the city. The names show the symbolism of his purpose. Eastern theology is mystic in its genius and altogether alien to the rationalism of the West. In the twentieth century, however much the Greek lives by his Orthodoxy, he is tolerant and has a deep, sympathetic instinct for truth wherever he finds it. By intellect and temperament he is ready to perceive that there is a part of truth in all religions, and finds the fulfilment of them all in Christianity. Not that his faith is eclectic. It is synthetic. The comparison of the Incarnation to the assumption of the best of all religions into the creed of the Cross is a favourite illustration of Orthodox preachers. But in the time of Constantine the synthesis was in process. The Church was not only busy in systematizing her theology, she was absorbing all that was best in pagan thought.

The titles which Constantine gave to his two Churches are symbolical. All human wisdoms were gathered up in the holy Revelation of the Divine Wisdom in Christ, Who is the eternal Word. Henceforth the world would grow more and more to be as God designed it to be. The one perfect and ideal order had at last been established. Sophia, Wisdom, ruled in Christendom, and its effect was Eirene, Peace, *i.e.*, the harmony of unchecked, happy life.

The symbolism was carried out in the actual building. Constantine's St. Sophia and its successor, Theodosius II.'s, were built four square. Justinian's, as all the world knows, combined the square and the circle: the symbols of human and Divine perfection. There is no need here¹ to dwell further on the matter or to describe the wonderful beauty of the great church as it still stands.

When Justinian erected a colossal statue of Solomon, sitting cheek on hand in his chariot and looking disconsolately at the vast dome of

¹ See the writer's "Redemption of St. Sophia."

the shrine which had eclipsed his temple, he did not do a foolish thing. St. Sophia is incomparable, the worthy symbolic mother-church of the symbolic mother-city of God's Kingdom on earth.

In the first three and a half centuries of her rule Constantinople had many troubles. Wisdom did not prevail in her empire, and Peace did not reign within her virgin triple walls. Hordes of half-savages from the shadowy uncivilized world first plundered and then made their homes in her lands. She knew the horrors of anarchy and civil war. But neither her own rebels nor her barbarian settlers dreamed of destroying her. She seemed as fixed in her place as the sun in the heavens. If she did not rule, she reigned, the unchallenged queen-city of civilization.

By the beginning, however, of the ninth century two rival systems, both of which claimed to supersede her as exclusively the divinely ordered world state, had come into being, attacking her the one from the East, the other from the West. They brought her doom in the end.

Islam arose early in the seventh century, and, allowing for its coarser lines, Islam was only the counterpart of Christendom. Mohammed, the apostle, and his khalifs (*i.e.*, successors) took the place of the Emperors, the Koran that of the Bible and all other law, the recitation of the *takbir* that of baptism. That was all.

Mutatis mutandis Islam appropriated the form and function of Christendom. It had its own Sophia and Eirene. Its birthright was to spread the one and to establish the other. Its theory left no room for any outsider and claimed the boundaries of the world as its limits. The infidel must be extirpated. If the Jew and Christian were to be suffered to live on its sacred soil, their existence was to be exceptional, of mercy, and not of right. It was the House of Peace, and must use the sword until it had utterly destroyed all that opposed it—*i.e.*, the House of War.

To the Arab, of course, Constantinople was the hub of the civilization of which he was outside. To fulfil its destiny, Islam must capture New Rome and absorb its world-empire. The onrush of its first fanaticism brought it twice to the very walls of Constantinople. A succession of singularly able Emperors drove it back and held it off by land and sea. Egypt and Africa, Syria and Mesopotamia, however, were lost to Christendom, and became the chief lands of Islam. The Arab *élan* died down, and the two rival world-systems were left for centuries in the equipoise of a struggle which was incapable of more than a passing truce. When at last the Othmanli Turks appeared on the scene and became the sword of Islam, they were able to give the deathblow to the Empire only because its strength had been sapped by a third rival.

When in A.D. 800 Pope Leo III. crowned Charlemagne, his recogni-

tion as a colleague in the imperial office would have been an easy reversion to precedent for Constantinople. The theory of the undivided empire might have been untouched. Strictly speaking, there never were an Eastern Empire and a Western Empire. All that happened when the last Western Emperor resigned was that the Senate of Old Rome sent his insignia to the Emperor in New Rome, who went on reigning alone. As before 476, there would simply have been an Emperor in the West in addition to the customary one or more Emperors in the East. But the innovation meant a great deal more. Behind Charlemagne was the transformed Papacy, which had just learnt to state a case for universal overlordship in things spiritual and was preparing to extend the pretension to things temporal. That meant a fundamental revolution in the theory of œcumenical polity. Compromise was impossible between the principle that Christendom is a single state in which authority is mediated through a supreme pontiff, whom Divine Grace will not suffer to err, and the principle that it is a single state in which authority is mediated through the whole body which, as the organism of supernatural faith and love, is preserved by Divine Grace in harmonious orthodoxy. The issue once perceived, Eastern Christendom began a stubborn resistance to the innovation. In this resistance it has never wavered. On the other hand, sensitive as always to a flaw in the logic of its theory, the Papacy made no mistake about the matter. Its essential was to re-establish Old Rome as the metropolis of Christendom. To do that the preliminary was to get rid of the lingering prestige of Constantinople in the West. That business was begun by the quarrel with Photius in 863, and finished by the excommunication of Cerularius in 1054. The East and West having been divided by a sharp line, and the Papacy having made good its claims in the latter, the new order had still to get rid of the old and to bring the East into its obedience. Accordingly, from 1054 onward Constantinople was confronted with the choice of submission or destruction. To compel the former was the plain end for which the Papacy used both the Normans, the Crusaders, and their successors, the Venetians and Genoese, to attack the Empire and its power to withhold Western help against the menace of Islam. The policy became obdurate, inflexible, and secular. At times it seemed near success. In the thirteenth century a puppet Latin Emperor and a puppet Latin Patriarch were actually installed in Constantinople. Eastern Christendom, indeed, rallied at Nicea, behind the walls which had witnessed the laying down of its polity under Constantine. The Paleologues brought it back to its metropolis, but it never regained its material strength. The grip of its enemies was too firmly fixed. From the East the menace of Islam was resurgent. In the West, as Professor Diehl puts it, "La papauté d'autre part s'hypnotisa dans le

désir de refaire, du bon gré ou de force, l'union des Églises,"¹ i.e., to absorb its rival. Circumscribed, battered, and undermined, the Empire never hesitated in its choice. The assertion of the conciliar principle at Constance and Basle brought the Easterns to Florence. They were enmeshed and constrained to come to terms with the Papacy in order to buy help against the Turks, but the equivocal compromise by which Pope Eugenius boasted that he had gained his end and by which, as he knew, the Greeks meant to concede him nothing, was indignantly rejected at Constantinople. The fate of the East hung in the balance. It was clear that either the Pope or the Sultan would win the prize. The victory fell to Islam. Eastern Christendom preferred bondage and the Sultan's turban to apostasy and the Pope's tiara.

Mahommed II. captured Constantinople in 1453, turned St. Sophia into a mosque, and mere Sultan though he was, by their possession became the most powerful ruler in Islam. Seventy years later, his grandson, Selim, had added Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Arabia to his dominions, had secured the insignia of the Prophet, and had proclaimed himself successor to Motawakkil, the last true Arab khalif.

The secular ambition of Islam had at last been realized. New Rome (Constantinople) was a Moslem city and the hub of a Moslem world-state, which had superseded the Eastern Christendom, and was pressing on to bring the Western into its borders.

In superseding Eastern Christendom, however, it did not annihilate it. Its people knew the Koranic principle, and were wise to surrender before they were massacred. In consequence, Eastern Christendom survived, though, as it were, in an underworld with the Islamic Empire superimposed above it.

The Turk was content to allow it to live. He treated his Christian subjects as beings midway between himself and his domestic animals. They were his rayah, his cattle. He subjected them to degrading laws and forbade them to progress. He took full toll of their labour, and carried off a fixed proportion of their children as a tribute. They were allowed to "wear their heads" because he gave them leave, and needed their labour.

For three hundred years he never dreamed that they could pass from his power. Then his dream was shattered. Romans, Greeks, and Serbs gained their freedom. He changed his policy from the contemptuous toleration of his rayah to their extermination. In 1821, he massacred 100,000 of them in Smyrna alone. In the hundred years that have followed, he pursued his new policy methodically. Whenever he saw a safe opportunity he got rid of them by individuals or by tens

¹ Diehl, "Byzance," p. 256, 1919.

² The Arabs always declare a Turkish khalif to be absurd. If not descended from the Prophet, a true khalif must be an Arab.

of thousands. Abd-ul-Hamid, for example, was especially shrewd in gauging the number of Armenians of which he could dispose at any time without European intervention. In 1895-96 he wiped out 200,000.

Dr. Johannes Lepsius, ex-President of the Deutsche Orient Mission, who is a stout German, and assuredly no Armenian or American propagandist, has left us in no doubt that those "deportations" of Greeks, Syrians, and Armenians, which Mr. Morgenthau, the U.S.A. Ambassador, has described as the greatest crime in history, were planned and carried out on one principle. In the indignant report which he presented in 1916 to the Kaiser, and which the German Great Staff promptly suppressed, he has collated evidence, largely from German sources, which justifies his charging the Turkish nation with having made a systematic and sustained effort to wipe the Armenian and Syrian nations out of Asia Minor. His record of rape, of indescribable and bestial torture, of cold-blooded and wholesale butchery, and of the calculated doing to death by starvation, exposure, and similar methods, reads like the fantasy of a criminal lunatic. The horror remains motiveless and inexplicable until one reaches Lepsius' shorter chapter on "Les Conversions forcées." Then it is all clear. "Die Wahrheit kann nicht immer gesagt Werden," he writes. Turkey was Germany's ally. So he simply describes the thing, and leaves it to us to read the unwritten summing-up. Here are the facts: In every village and city, the same Government notice which ordered the Christians to prepare for deportation gave them the option of evading it by becoming Moslems. The statesmen in Constantinople declared that they were going to settle the Christian question. "Their fifteenth and sixteenth-century predecessors," Mr. Morgenthau writes, "treated the subject peoples as dirt under their feet, yet they believed that they had a certain usefulness, and did not disdain to make them serfs. The old conquering Turks had made the Christians their servants, but their parvenu descendants bettered their instruction, for they determined to exterminate them wholesale, and Turkify the Empire by massacring its non-Moslem elements."¹ "Had these old Moslem chieftains," he goes on, "when they conquered Bulgaria, put all the Bulgarians to the sword, there would never have been any modern Bulgarian question, and Turkey would never have lost this part of her empire. Similarly, had they destroyed all the Rumanians, Serbians, and Greeks, the provinces which are now occupied by these races would still have remained integral parts of the Sultan's domain. They felt that a terrible mistake had been made. . . . They would destroy all Greeks, Syrians, Armenians, and other Christians, move Moslem families into their homes," etc. "In order to accomplish this great reform it would not be necessary to murder every

¹ "Secrets of the Bosphorus," p. 188. Mr. Morgenthau is a Jew, and went to Constantinople eager to be a friend of the Turks.

living Christian. The most beautiful and healthy Armenian girls could be taken, converted forcibly to Mohammedanism, and made the wives or concubines of the followers of the Prophet. . . . Armenian boys of tender years could be taken into Turkish families, and be brought up in ignorance of the fact that they were anything but Moslems."

Doubtless many Turks hated the horrid business. A few tried to stop it. In his *first* short Grand-Vizierate, Ferid Damad, a man of fine character, did a little to avenge it and, the big men being out of his reach, hanged a few minor pashas and beys and left them strung up in the squares of Constantinople. None the less, the opinion of Moslem Turkey endorsed and approved the measure. In practically every village and city the thing was carried through with the sanction of religion. The leading Christians were summoned, were told that the law of Islam had tolerated their existence, but that this tolerance was withdrawn. They must choose between deportation and conversion. Refusal often meant instant death. "I have held my faith since youth, shall I renounce it now I am old? I rather renounce life," answered a merchant, by name Haroutioum Torikian, and was taken out and shot. The churches were everywhere turned into mosques. The houses and property of the deported Christians were confiscated in the name of the Sultan or allocated to Moslems. Everything was done that could be done thoroughly to purge Turkish soil of Christianity, and in the attempt the Moslem population was the willing instrument of its own authorities.

To indict a nation has been declared to be impossible. It is otherwise with a system.

To the mind of the ordinary Turk, that which we call Turkey is the Khalifate of Islam, the Divinely founded world-state in which none but Moslems have the right to live. If it had not been so, no mere love of plunder or blood could have made the methodical massacres of the past century possible.

Policy may dictate religious persecutions, but it must find its inspiration as well as their sanction in ethical categories.

It is here that the importance of St. Sophia appears at its true value.

In spite of three centuries of intolerable servitude and a hundred years of massacre, the Christians of "Turkey-in-Asia" have not been exterminated. In many parts they still form the majority of the population. Their lands are among the richest in the earth. Given the right to live and to develop, they will speedily take their ancient place in the front of civilization.

If they are to be left, as in the past, to certain oppression and to probable massacre, it would be more merciful to make a speedy end of them.

The way to break up a wheel is not to batter the rim but to knock out the hub.

The setting free one strip of country or the putting of guarantees into a treaty have been proved, if they ever needed proof, times without number, only to make the position of the Turks' rayah worse.

It is only when the Turkish system, with its categories, has gone and is forgotten that the Turkish Moslem will live in brotherhood with his Christian fellow-countrymen. The beginning and the end of the matter is in Constantinople. Take the Sultan out of it and give back the Great Church to Eastern Christendom, and the Turk, as in the Balkans, will shrug his shoulders before Kismet. The nightmare will be over and, like his brethren in the Balkans or fellow Moslems of the Indian and Arab civilizations, he will settle down into harmony and equality with those whom the theories of the Turkish Khalifate now teach him in the nursery to regard as beings of inferior creation to himself.

In fact, he expected, his Arab and Indian fellow-Moslems expected, even Enver, Halil, Mustapha Kemal, and the others who have had time to rally Moslem fanaticism to the idea that Islam is bound up with the Turkish Khalifate, expected a year ago that Great Britain would eject the Sultan from Constantinople.

To their minds Constantinople remains a Christian city. They know that it is held by the sword and the sword alone for Islam. It is essentially non-Moslem. To say nothing of its monuments, of the 1,173,670 people in its vilayet, 724,556 are Christians. The work of assimilating it to Islam is still unfinished. They were ready to see Eastern Christendom freed and recover its own.

Above all, they expected the reconsecration of St. Sophia. "You will of course take back your churches which we turned into mosques," the Turkish governor wrote to the Metropolitan of Trebizond in 1916. Why? Because their being used as mosques is the symbol of the servitude of the people to whom they belong. St. Sophia has no other claim to be a "holy place" in Turkish eyes.

That, indeed, is the importance to the Turk of the great mother church. He has never been at home in it. Its very fabric is unsuited for Moslem worship. He must stand askew with its axis when he faces towards Mecca. He has hung up his banners for tokens of conquest on its walls, but, as a dozen of his own superstitions tell us, he has always thought that sooner or later he must cease to usurp it.

This article was written before the publication of the San Remo terms.

The fiat has gone forth that the Sultan is still to have his capital in Constantinople and that St. Sophia is to remain a Turkish mosque. It is a great disaster. The Greek will regard the treaty when signed as only provisional. He will never rest until he has regained his mother city and has set the cross upon the dome of his matchless mother

church. He may wait ten years, twenty years, half a century, but he would be false to his name and nation if he forgot Constantinople and St. Sophia. Meanwhile the Turk will not cease to regard his Christian subjects as an encumbrance. If he does not extirpate them in a sea of blood, he will continue to oppress them and to treat them as his cattle. There can be no lasting peace in the Near East until, by the re-consecration of St. Sophia as the metropolis of the Orthodox World, the Turk has learnt that his tyranny is once and for all dispersed.

CONVOCATION AND THE ANGLICAN LITURGY

READERS of that most instructive Alcuin Club Tract called "Russian Observations upon the American Prayer Book," will not easily forget the criticisms to which not only the American Communion Office, but also our present Anglican Liturgy is subjected.

The Russian theologians maintained that the Anglican Use stands in need of stronger and clearer emphasis on the fact that the Eucharist is not only a manward gift, but also a Godward appeal and presentation.

It will therefore be of interest to members of the Eastern Church to know the efforts which have been made of late among Anglicans to secure a revision of this kind.

The two Houses of the Canterbury Convocation, after much debate and delay, agreed upon the following alterations and additions to the existing Consecration Prayer:

"(1) The Prayer of Humble Access to be moved so as to follow immediately after the Comfortable Words.

"(2) In the Prayer of Consecration the following words to be added after the Words of Institution:

"Wherefore, O Father, we Thy humble servants, having in remembrance before Thee the precious Death of Thy dear Son, His mighty Resurrection and glorious Ascension, looking also for His coming again, do render unto Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits which He hath procured unto us. And we pray Thee of Thine almighty goodness to send us and upon these Thy gifts Thy Holy and Blessed Spirit, who is the Sanctifier and the Giver of Life, to whom with Thee and Thy Son Jesus Christ be ascribed by every creature in earth and heaven all blessing, honour, glory, and power, now henceforth and for evermore. Amen."

"(3) The Lord's Prayer to be placed after the Prayer of Consecration, prefaced by the words: 'As our Saviour Christ hath commanded and taught us, we are told to say. *Then shall the people join with the Priest, and say:* Our Father . . . for ever and ever. Amen.'

"(4) The Prayer of Oblation to retain its present position; the rubric before it to read: '*Then shall be said one or both of the following:*' and the present rubric before the Thanksgiving to be omitted."

This revision, which was intended to be an optional alternative to the existing Use, is an acknowledgment that some additions were much

desired, but it has not succeeded in securing the approval of the Church at large. It is strongly opposed by High Churchmen on the ground that it is quite inadequate.

The truth is that a far more satisfactory revision was previously passed by the Bishops and accepted by the House of Priests, and then unfortunately abandoned and thrown away.

The wording of this previous revision was the following:

"Permission shall be given for the rearrangement of the Canon as follows: The Prayer of Humble Access to be removed from its present position and placed immediately before the Communion of Priest and People; the *Amen* at the end of the present Prayer of Consecration to be omitted, and the Prayer of Oblation to follow at once, prefaced by these words: '*Wherefore, O Lord and Heavenly Father, according to the Institution of Thy dearly beloved Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, we, Thy humble servants, do exhibit and make here before Thy Divine Majesty with these Thy holy gifts the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make, having in remembrance His blessed Passion, mighty Resurrection, and glorious Ascension, rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same, entirely desiring Thy Fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice,*' etc.; and then the Lord's Prayer."

Now the contrast between these two forms of revision is obvious. The form which the Canterbury Convocation has abandoned contains the definite term "memorial," whereas the form to which the Convocation has consented deliberately left this expression out.

Moreover, the form which the Canterbury Convocation has passed refuses to unite the Prayer of Oblation to the Consecration Prayer.

High Churchmen, therefore, as a body, with very few exceptions, feel that this alternative form of Eucharist is a serious failure. Their grievance has always been, to quote Bishop Dowden, of Edinburgh, that the existing Use is "a faulty compromise, to be borne with indeed for the sake of unity, but still painfully defective in some matters of grave importance."¹

What troubled them most of all was that the aspect of the Godward offering is obscure in the existing Rite. And this is precisely what the revised alternative now presented to them fails to remedy. For this revision has added an act of remembrance, an act of thanksgiving, and an act of invocation: but it has excluded the term "memorial" and the term "offering."

The consequence is that unless something further can be done, High Churchmen would rather go on as they are and continue to use a notoriously imperfect Rite, rather than to adopt certain inadequate alterations which might indefinitely postpone a more satisfactory revision.

However, there seems another possibility, which, if it can secure the approval of the Church, will tend to bring the English Church into

¹ Dowden, "Annotated Scotch Communion Office" (1884), p. 59.

closer relation with the ancient Liturgies and thereby with the Church of the East. A proposal was made in the Canterbury House of Priests in April last "that subject to the Diocesan's approval the Scottish Communion Office may be used as an alternative to the Office now in use."

This would mean to sanction the use of a third independent Rite under Diocesan approval, in addition to the Unrevised and the Revised Versions.

It is most significant of the general feeling among the Priests of the Lower House that this somewhat startling innovation was passed by a majority of 56 votes to 22.

Various reasons contributed to promote this result. Some felt that High Churchmen had a reasonable grievance which ought to be removed. Some were prompted by an earnest desire for peace. Some felt that, having insisted for all they were worth on the principle of inclusiveness, they could not reject it in the present case without stultifying what they had hitherto maintained. Some felt that there is much to be said against a rigid uniformity. If you insist on imposing one Rite only where various schools exist, then compromise becomes inevitable. For in that case you can only allow to one school what the other school will consent to repeat. But this means that the sharp edges of definite statement are obliterated. And since the power of a doctrine depends on the clearness with which it is expressed the result of compromise is a serious loss of the effectiveness of truth. Language which is designedly indeterminate and non-committal brings as its retribution loss of religious power.

Some, again, felt that the history of uniformity was far more political than religious. It was enjoined by statesmen in the interests of national unity, rather than by theologians in the interests of faith. The modern Roman effort to tolerate the smallest possible liturgical deviation, under the ideal that the whole earth is to become of one language and one Liturgy, was no reason why the method should be perpetuated in the English Church.

The primitive centuries exhibit no exclusive insistence on any one liturgical Rite. It should not be forgotten that the Greek Church allows the existence of three liturgies: that of St. John Chrysostom, that of St. Basil, and the Rite of the Presanctified. Various liturgies exist in different Churches which are in full Communion with our own. Moreover, the essentials of a valid Eucharist are few, and provided that these are fulfilled, a Church could lawfully sanction considerable variations.

If these considerations were applied to the English Church it is worth reflecting whether the whole history of the Church of England since what is called the Elizabethan Settlement would not have been far

more inclusive of the whole nation if both the two Liturgies of Edward had been made permissible alternatives. If the intention really was to include two opposing schools in one Communion, would not the intention be more probably achieved by allowing to either side its full devotional expression, provided, of course, that these expressions were (1) within the limits of the Faith, and (2) under the sanction of ecclesiastical authority?

There certainly exists a widespread conviction within the English Church, as well as beyond its limits, irrespective of party and of school, that spiritual unity is hindered rather than secured by Acts of Uniformity.

It is also obvious that reunion between the severed communities of English Christianity will never come about on the basis of liturgical uniformity.

Indeed, the Convocation of the English Church has committed itself to the principle of variety of liturgical Use. It has acknowledged the inadequacy of the present Eucharistic Rite, for it has been spending years in revising that Rite. It certainly will not deny that the revised edition is a compromise, liable to further revision in a few years' time, for it is distinctly declared that this revised edition is intended for experimental use during a period to be hereafter determined. Thus two Liturgies will be simultaneously in use in the English Church. And this co-existence of two Liturgies having once been sanctioned, it is unlikely that it will be terminated. For while some may prefer the revised edition, the more conservative section may still cling to the traditional Rite. In any case, whatever the future may produce, there are many who do not see why Convocation should restrict Anglican devotion to two forms, one of which it pronounces to be inadequate to our age, while it confesses the other to be a compromise.

The reason why the Scottish Liturgy approved itself to the Lower House of the Canterbury Convocation is that it is a living Rite in actual use in a Church which is in full Communion with the English Church. It is a Rite according to which many of our laity communicate, and a number of our priests and bishops celebrate the Sacred Mysteries when they are in Scotland.

Moreover, the distinctive characteristic of the Scottish Liturgy is that it emphasizes with great clearness the two main aspects of the Eucharist: the offering to God the Father, and the reception of the Gift. It does this by grouping together at the Consecration the narrative of the Institution, the Oblation, the Invocation of the Holy Spirit. It replaces the Prayer of Oblation, and adds next the Prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church (that is, the Intercessions), and concludes with the Lord's Prayer. After this completion of the Godward offering, it groups together all the prayers concerned with the reception of the Sacred Gift.

Of course, it must be distinctly understood that the approval of this Scottish Rite by the Lower House of the Canterbury Convocation is its acceptance by one House only out of four. But the number of clergy in this House makes its decision significant of a very widespread tendency in the English Church at large. On this account the movement may be of interest to members of the Eastern Church.

RUSSIAN LITURGY AT BOW CHURCH

BY THE REV. CANON MASTERMAN

THE influx of refugees from Russia has made the accommodation of the Embassy Chapel entirely inadequate for the needs of the Russian community. With the approval of the Bishop of London, and the sanction of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Rector of St. Mary-le-Bow Church, Cheapside, has offered to lend the church to the Russian Parochial Committee on Sunday mornings, and the Russian Liturgy will be celebrated there at 11 a.m. every Sunday morning till the middle of August. The loan of our historic church in the heart of the city, with the full sanction of the Anglican Ecclesiastical Authorities, for the needs of the Russian Church is a hopeful evidence of the closer relationship that is growing up between our own Church and the Orthodox Eastern Churches. The discussion that is now going on with regard to the future of the City churches suggests the possibility that one of these churches might be handed over to the Russian Committee as a permanent centre for worship. Either St. Nicholas, Cole Abbey, or St. Vedast's, Foster Lane (both scheduled for demolition), would serve admirably for the purpose. Meanwhile, the temporary use of St. Mary-le-Bow will enable the Russian Committee to judge how far a church in the City meets the needs of a population scattered over all parts of London. So far the attendance has been very satisfactory. The needs of the congregation of St. Mary-le-Bow have been met by the reopening, on Sunday mornings, of St. Anne's, Gresham Street.

THE MANSFIELD RESOLUTIONS

THE following passage is from the letter of a Serbian student resident in Athens.

"The Mansfield College Manifesto has aroused a great interest among all those who have so far heard of it. I was very sorry after I had read it, and not a little surprised to see that it was signed by men like Dr.—, whom I should never expect to do so. Judging from the correspondence on the subject in *The Church Times*, I think

that it is doomed to prove a failure. There can be no doubt about the sincerity and purity of purpose on the part of its authors, but in my humble opinion the whole business, even if only partly successful, would be disastrous if one considers it in connection with the problem of reunion with Rome and the East. I consider it my duty to tell you sincerely one thing more: The Mansfield Manifesto will be a new serious obstacle to many who are active Eastern workers on behalf of reunion with the Anglican Church. It may darken their vision and restrain their activity. I wish I knew what you, Fr. Frere, Fr. Puller, and Fr. Pullan think about it!"

It ought to be generally known that the Anglican and Eastern Association have adopted the following resolution on the Mansfield College Manifesto:

"Resolution adopted by the General Committee of the above Association at a meeting held on Wednesday, May 5, 1920, at 3 p.m., in the Vestry of the Church of St. Mary-le-Bow, Cheapside.

"In view of the Resolutions recently passed at the Mansfield College Conference, the Committee of the Anglican and Eastern Association deems it to be its duty to point out how seriously our growing co-operation and fraternal relations with the Eastern Orthodox Churches (constituting one of the most hopeful of facts in the religious life of to-day) will be jeopardized by the appearance of disloyalty to the true position of the Church as evidenced in the following clauses of the Mansfield Resolution:

"(1) Subject to the same authority, mutual admission to the Lord's Table."

"(2) Recognition of the fact that the denominations to which we severally belong are equally as corporate groups within the One Church of Christ."

"Forasmuch as this will give Eastern Orthodox theologians the *prima facie* impression:

"(1) That Episcopalians should be advised to receive the Holy Communion at the hands of non-episcopally ordained ministers.

"(2) That not merely are the members of non-episcopal bodies within the One Church as individuals, but that their ministry is a regular and rightly organized one."

It was resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to any signatories of the Mansfield Manifesto who are members of the Anglican and Eastern Association, to the Press, to the Archbishop's Committee, to the two Archbishops, and others.

A RUSSIAN LAYMAN ON REUNION

BY THE EDITOR

"THE greatest misfortune that befell mankind," says Kiréeff, "was, without doubt, the schism of Rome from the Œcumenical Church. The greatest blessing would be the reunion of East and West, the reconstitution of the great Christian unity."¹

Alexander Kiréeff, the author of these words, was one of the most distinguished laymen of the nineteenth century in the Russian Church. He was a soldier, and rose to the rank of general. He held a confidential position in the Russian Court, where he spent much time in the functions of the Palace, and was for years in constant attendance on the Grand Duke Constantine during the tragic period of that prince's mental decay.

He was a Russian of exceptional culture: able to write articles in Russian, German, and French. It is this literary command of languages which has brought him within our reach. He was a constant contributor for nearly twenty years to the *Revue Internationale de Théologie*, which was partly his own creation. A selection of his chief theological essays has been published by Mme. Olga Novikoff since his death; also a very interesting volume of letters written to the Old Catholic professor, Michaud. These volumes bring the author within our reach while Russian is for us an unknown tongue.

Kiréeff was certainly one of the most accomplished lay theologians of the Russian Church. He was one of those laymen whose supreme interest lies in loyalty to the Church. "I belong," he wrote, "to an ancient family which has always taken its Orthodoxy seriously. The Kiréeffs, at the end of the sixteenth century, suffered cruel persecutions from the Roman Church in Poland, because they refused to go over to the Jesuits."² And Alexander Kiréeff was wholeheartedly true to the family tradition. He was constitutionally incapable of compromise. "Diplomacy," he said, "is the only thing of which I am afraid."³ He would be no party to diplomacies in the sphere of religion. His letters reveal a character marked by depth of personal devotion and a simple faith undisturbed by philosophic doubt. To Western Rationalism he was quite impervious. Of living philosophers there were, in his opinion, only two: Sidgwick in England, and Hartmann in Germany. The former was only a compiler, and the constructive efforts of the latter were little more than Buddhism caricatured.⁴ With that impression he left Philosophy and sought security in Religion. His belief in the Orthodox

¹ "L'ancien-Catholicisme," p. 134.

² "Lettres," p. 63.

³ "Lettres," p. 128.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 137.

Church could scarcely be surpassed, and his loyalty corresponded with his belief. — He spent the greater portion of his life and the best of his energies for the Orthodox Church, in ceaseless efforts to defend its doctrine and extend its influence. It was impossible for him to confine his interests within the precinct of Orthodoxy. He looked out on the divisions of Christendom with profound distress, and felt to a quite unusual degree the obligation of concerning himself with the problems of reunion. The consequence is that he became one of the most conspicuous promoters of better mutual understanding and closer relation between the great separate Communion of Christendom.

I

The Orthodox principle is fundamentally that nothing but the doctrine and canons of the Undivided Church are binding upon all the Churches of Christendom.¹ Kiréeff appeals to the famous test formulated by St. Vincent of Lerins in the fifth century, that the Christian truth consists of that which the Church has maintained at all times everywhere. Universality in time and space is the certain test of genuine Christianity. Thus the witness of the Undivided Church is our security. Regard must be directed especially to the period before the division between East and West. The Orthodox Eastern Church is the Church of the Seven Councils: the four of Nicæa, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon; together with the three following Councils of Constantinople.

Moreover, the constitutional leaders of the Church are its bishops. The Faith is witnessed to by the collective episcopate. And in this episcopate none stands essentially distinct in authority above another.

This means a very strong insistence on the principle of authority. Kiréeff lays down four points: (1) There exists in religion such a thing as absolute truth. (2) That truth is entrusted to the keeping of the Universal Church. (3) That Church exists in perpetuity. (4) Its decisions are irreversible.

But this authority of the Councils of the Church does not at all mean that the decisions of the collective episcopate are of themselves irreversible. What Easterns maintain is that acceptance by the Church is indispensable to give validity to conciliar decrees.² For the hierarchy is not the Church. The consent of the laity is necessary to raise a Council to the rank of universal authority.

Hence, in the Orthodox conception, the ancient doctrine may become clearly defined, but no new doctrine can be added to the contents of the Faith. Only in this restricted sense can the principle of development be legitimate.

¹ "Lettres," p. 76.

² *Ibid.*, p. 70.

Kiréeff was most careful to distinguish between the infallible authority of the Universal Church and the liability of the local Churches—even the most eminent among them—to fail.¹ "Does not history show us the two most conspicuous Patriarchal Sees, about 630, that of Rome and that of Constantinople, occupied by two heretics, Honorius and Sergius?"²

Kiréeff was well aware that this attitude towards religious truth is not without its dangers. It might easily encourage an ultra-conservative disposition, a narrowed outlook, an over-emphasizing of minor differences, and a reluctance to unite with Churches which were fundamentally orthodox. Kiréeff thought that there was a very stiff and rigid temper exhibited in certain directions in the Russian Church: the exaggerations of a quality which in itself was excellent.³ He could not forget that Russian theologians persisted in regarding the Metropolitan Philaret of Moscow as an innovator and even a dangerous free-thinker. Moreover, there was within the Eastern Church a mass of ultra-conservative habit which was hostile to every religious conception arriving from the West.⁴

On the other hand, the educated Russians who travelled came very much indeed under Western influence. Residence in Paris or Berlin did not promote religious conservatism. Western influence penetrated deeply into Russia itself. Kiréeff recognized two opposing tendencies within the Russian Church: the one toward Protestantism, the other toward Ultramontanism.⁵ Both these tendencies had a lengthy history. They exist at the present day. Kiréeff refers to Vladimir Solovieff as an example of the latter, whose book on the Church is of a thoroughly romanizing character. Kiréeff did his utmost in six months' controversy with his brilliant, versatile, and imaginative fellow-countryman to steady him against reactions and extremes, but was reluctantly driven to the confession that his opponent was half a papist.⁶ It must, however, be acknowledged that Kiréeff was hardly qualified by his outlook on modern philosophic thought to be a successful guide to such a mind as Vladimir Solovieff.

II

From these orthodox principles it is quite easy to see what Kiréeff's attitude was toward the Roman Church.

He considered that the relations of Rome toward the Eastern Church were exceedingly clever but not conducive to reunion.⁷ All endeavours between Rome and the other great Patriarchates to come to

¹ "L'ancien-Catholicisme," p. 74.

² *Ibid.*, p. 187.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 117.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 239.

⁷ "Lettres," p. 119, 152, 153.

an understanding since the time of the great schism have been doomed to failure because the motives which prompted them were political and utilitarian rather than religious.¹ Kiréeff recognizes quite clearly that these inferior motives existed on either side.

The concessions made at Florence by courtierly ecclesiastics were never endorsed by the Greek people.² It was the leaders who were at fault. But Kiréeff's distrust of the Roman Church was so profound that he did not hesitate to say that there was a sense in which the Greeks were right in preferring the Sultan to the Pope, because under the former they retained their spiritual independence.

For in Kiréeff's view the great cause of division between East and West was the Papacy, since the Papacy had monopolized a power which properly belonged to the entire Church.³ The authority of the Church may not be converted into a papal monopoly.

This is the ground of Eastern hostility to the Papacy. It is the reason why submission to Rome is quite impossible.⁴ For a thousand years the East was one with the West, and acknowledged a primacy of the Bishop of Rome (*primus inter pares*). But Western Christianity has in the process of time undergone very serious modifications. Papal infallibility has simply revolutionized the character of the Western Church.

We are here involved in the problem: What is the true place of development in Christianity? Kiréeff recognized development in the sense that when the Church's dogmas are attacked by some fresh heresy their reaffirmation by a Universal Council is required. But this reaffirmation must be the act of the Church as a whole and not of a portion of it only. If a portion of the Church proceeds to formulate dogmas, such as the Immaculate Conception, for which there is no necessity, it is embarked on a mistaken career. It is the Church's function to enforce the ancient contents of the Faith, not to make new additions.⁵

With regard to the dogma of Papal Infallibility, Kiréeff had very much to say. He wrote a series of letters about it in reply to a Roman priest. He points out that Infallibility, even as Bossuet understood it, depended on the consent of the Church. But this limitation of the papal prerogative is exactly what the Ultramontanes have rejected. They have expressly defined that the Papal Infallibility does not depend on the consent of the Church (*non autem ex consensu Ecclesiæ*).

Kiréeff's interpretation of history is that after the separation of the Churches the primacy of the Roman Patriarch was gradually transformed into a monarchy. That was the first period of its development. In the second period the doctrine maintained was that the Infallibility of the

¹ "Lettres," p. 76.

² *Ibid.*, p. 42.

³ "L'ancien-Catholicisme," p. 74.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 255.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 255.

Kiréeff was most careful to distinguish between the infallible authority of the Universal Church and the liability of the local Churches—even the most eminent among them—to fail.¹ "Does not history show us the two most conspicuous Patriarchal Sees, about 630, that of Rome and that of Constantinople, occupied by two heretics, Honorius and Sergius?"²

Kiréeff was well aware that this attitude towards religious truth is not without its dangers. It might easily encourage an ultra-conservative disposition, a narrowed outlook, an over-emphasizing of minor differences, and a reluctance to unite with Churches which were fundamentally orthodox. Kiréeff thought that there was a very stiff and rigid temper exhibited in certain directions in the Russian Church: the exaggerations of a quality which in itself was excellent.³ He could not forget that Russian theologians persisted in regarding the Metropolitan Philaret of Moscow as an innovator and even a dangerous free-thinker. Moreover, there was within the Eastern Church a mass of ultra-conservative habit which was hostile to every religious conception arriving from the West.⁴

On the other hand, the educated Russians who travelled came very much indeed under Western influence. Residence in Paris or Berlin did not promote religious conservatism. Western influence penetrated deeply into Russia itself. Kiréeff recognized two opposing tendencies within the Russian Church: the one toward Protestantism, the other toward Ultramontanism.⁵ Both these tendencies had a lengthy history. They exist at the present day. Kiréeff refers to Vladimir Solovieff as an example of the latter, whose book on the Church is of a thoroughly romanizing character. Kiréeff did his utmost in six months' controversy with his brilliant, versatile, and imaginative fellow-countryman to steady him against reactions and extremes, but was reluctantly driven to the confession that his opponent was half a papist.⁶ It must, however, be acknowledged that Kiréeff was hardly qualified by his outlook on modern philosophic thought to be a successful guide to such a mind as Vladimir Solovieff.

II

From these orthodox principles it is quite easy to see what Kiréeff's attitude was toward the Roman Church.

He considered that the relations of Rome toward the Eastern Church were exceedingly clever, but not conducive to reunion.⁷ All endeavours between Rome and the other great Patriarchates to come to

¹ "L'ancien-Catholicisme," p. 74.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*, p. 187.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 239.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 117.

⁶ "Lettres," p. 119, 152, 153.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

an understanding since the time of the great schism have been doomed to failure because the motives which prompted them were political and utilitarian rather than religious.¹ Kiréeff recognizes quite clearly that these inferior motives existed on either side.

The concessions made at Florence by courtierly ecclesiastics were never endorsed by the Greek people.² It was the leaders who were at fault. But Kiréeff's distrust of the Roman Church was so profound that he did not hesitate to say that there was a sense in which the Greeks were right in preferring the Sultan to the Pope, because under the former they retained their spiritual independence.

For in Kiréeff's view the great cause of division between East and West was the Papacy, since the Papacy had monopolized a power which properly belonged to the entire Church.³ The authority of the Church may not be converted into a papal monopoly.

This is the ground of Eastern hostility to the Papacy. It is the reason why submission to Rome is quite impossible.⁴ For a thousand years the East was one with the West, and acknowledged a primacy of the Bishop of Rome (*primus inter pares*). But Western Christianity has in the process of time undergone very serious modifications. Papal infallibility has simply revolutionized the character of the Western Church.

We are here involved in the problem: What is the true place of development in Christianity? Kiréeff recognized development in the sense that when the Church's dogmas are attacked by some fresh heresy their reaffirmation by a Universal Council is required. But this reaffirmation must be the act of the Church as a whole and not of a portion of it only. If a portion of the Church proceeds to formulate dogmas, such as the Immaculate Conception, for which there is no necessity, it is embarked on a mistaken career. It is the Church's function to enforce the ancient contents of the Faith, not to make new additions.⁵

With regard to the dogma of Papal Infallibility, Kiréeff had very much to say. He wrote a series of letters about it in reply to a Roman priest. He points out that Infallibility, even as Bossuet understood it, depended on the consent of the Church. But this limitation of the papal prerogative is exactly what the Ultramontanes have rejected. They have expressly defined that the Papal Infallibility does not depend on the consent of the Church (*non autem ex consensu Ecclesiae*).

Kiréeff's interpretation of history is that after the separation of the Churches the primacy of the Roman Patriarch was gradually transformed into a monarchy. That was the first period of its development. In the second period the doctrine maintained was that the Infallibility of the

¹ "Lettres," p. 76.

² *Ibid.*, p. 42.

³ "L'ancien-Catholicisme," p. 74.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 255.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 255.

Church is subject to the consent of the Pope. Then came a third period when the doctrine maintained was that the Infallibility of the Pope is subject to the consent of the Church. Finally, the fourth period arrived when the doctrine formulated was the Infallibility of the Pope irrespective of the consent of the Church.¹

Thus by a series of fallacies Primacy is transmuted into Infallibility.

In the Decree of 1870 there is not a word about Papal Infallibility being in union with the Church, but only concerning Infallibility of the Pope.

Down to the year 1870 Papal Infallibility was an *opinion*. It could be contradicted. It was actually contradicted by Roman teachers. Now it is a *dogma*. To reject it now is *ipso facto* to become a heretic.²

Kiréeff as a son of the Orthodox East had watched the vacillations of the minority at the Vatican Council and deplored them. What pained him most was the attitude of the German historian Hefele. The learned author of the "History of the Councils" declared when he went to the Vatican Council, I am a Catholic but no Roman. But, says Kiréeff, he proved himself to be the opposite: a Roman and no Catholic.³ Nor were the Bishops of France any better.

The prospect of a better understanding with Rome seemed to Kiréeff extremely dark. He observes that while Pius IX. was incessantly declaring his infallibility, Leo XIII. passed it over in a silence which was profoundly significant.⁴ The dogma was being held in reserve. But in a future period no one could predict in what manner it would be turned to account.⁵ Meanwhile Kiréeff felt that "a skilful diplomatist," like Leo XIII., "would do his utmost" with the wording of the dogmatic constitution of 1870. "Yet finally he will be obliged to avow that union with Rome is submission to Rome." And Rome since 1870 cannot mean a papal theory of ecclesiastical right or human right only. It must mean a divine right: a right to decide in doctrine, not subject to the consent of the Church.⁶

And therefore in Kiréeff's opinion any union with modern Rome is, as far as the East is concerned, absolutely out of the question.⁷ He does not hesitate to say that the most false of all false Councils is that of the Vatican.⁸

The tendency in Rome which Kiréeff views with infinite distress is the tendency to transform theological opinions into necessary dogmas of the Faith.⁹

Meanwhile Kiréeff profoundly deplored the disappearance of the Gallican Tradition in modern France. "Is the Gallican spirit so changed," he asks, "that it is impossible to discover any traces of it in

¹ "L'ancien-Catholicisme," p. 272.

² *Ibid.*, p. 289.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 69.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 70.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 90.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 91.

⁸ "Lettres," p. 133.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 100.

the country of Bossuet and the great Christian thinkers of Port-Royal?"¹

But Kiréeff saw clearly enough that modern French hostility to the Pope involved in reality hostility to the whole Christian religion and rejection of the Person of Jesus Christ.² The removal of the crucifix from the schools, under the pretext that the Pope had placed it there, was a thinly veiled attack on fundamental Christian principles.

III

If Kiréeff represents the Greek attitude as opposed to Romanism on the ground of its additions to the Faith, he no less represents it as opposed to Protestantism on the ground of its omissions and defects.

There are, maintains Kiréeff, two opposite misconceptions concerning authority: the Roman and the Protestant. He held that when Protestants complain of the Papal idea the Romanist rightly retorted that among Protestants every individual was his own Pope: his own interpreter of the Word of God. If Roman Catholicism drove the principle of ecclesiastical authority to extremes, Protestantism denied it altogether.³ Thus Protestantism is an extreme reaction from the Roman view. Romanism erred by excess, Protestantism by defect.

Kiréeff followed here much the same lines as Dollinger in his lecture on Reunion. Dollinger's critical judgment was that "it is impossible not to perceive that in the first heat of the struggle and passionate excitement of the Reformation tempest, many doctrines and practices of the ancient Church were much too hastily rejected."⁴ Kiréeff put it in more homely terms. He said that the Reformers of the sixteenth century threw away the precious with the worthless.⁵ They not only emptied out the bath but the baby with it. Dollinger predicted that a time would come when the Petrine and Pauline Churches will develop into a Johannine Church.⁶ Kiréeff urged that what is wanted is a balance between the correlatives of individual independence and social authority. It was the loss of ecclesiastical authority which rendered Protestantism powerless against its Roman antagonist. Now here, says Kiréeff, is the providential mission of the East. It must show the way of reconciliation between the Roman and the Protestant extremes. Easterns must be the disciples of St. John between the opposing disciples of St. Peter and St. Paul.⁷

Up to 1870, in Kiréeff's opinion, the Eastern Church was far nearer to the Roman than to Protestantism. But that is not the case since the erection of Papal Infallibility into a dogma. For henceforward a

¹ "Lettres," p. 23.

² *Ibid.*, p. 85, 1881.

³ "L'ancien-Catholicisme," p. 268.

⁴ Dollinger, "Lectures on Reunion," p. 13.

⁵ "L'ancien-Catholicisme," p. 37.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 13.

⁷ "L'ancien-Catholicisme," 260.

Protestant can agree with the Orthodox. But a Roman cannot. If he attempted to hold the Orthodox conception of infallibility he would be *ipso facto* excommunicate.

Nevertheless it was impossible for Kiréeff to contemplate Reunion with Protestants. The unity of the Church could only be reconstituted on the basis of the dogmatic principles of the first eight centuries.¹ What prospect did Protestantism present of unity on such terms as these?²

IV

But if no promising sphere for the beginnings of Union could be found within the Papal Church or in the Protestant communities, Kiréeff thought that the opportunity presented itself among the Old Catholics of Germany. Here was a type of Christianity which was neither Roman nor Protestant, but distinctly Catholic. What it rejected was papal monarchy and its development. Its appeal was to the Undivided Church. Kiréeff watched the movement with joy, with fervour, with exultation. Here was a type of Catholicism which the Orthodox could recognize.³ The validity of the succession at Utrecht was assured.⁴ In the case of Bishop Reinkens his claim was incontestible.⁵ Kiréeff was in touch with all the Old Catholic chiefs: with Dollinger, Langen, Michaud, Reinkens, and Herzog. He attended the Old Catholic conferences at Bonn in 1874 and 1875. He roused so much interest among the Russian clergy that, in spite of severely adverse criticism from the more conservative sections, he was made official representative of the Holy Synod on Old Catholic affairs. He was warmly supported by farsighted ecclesiastics, such as Procopius, Metropolitan of Athens, and the Metropolitan of St. Petersburg. He became one of the founders of the *Revue Internationale de Théologie*, which is still one of the most important organs on behalf of Reunion. He constantly contributed to its pages, sometimes to introduce Russian theological treatises to the attention of students in other Churches, sometimes to criticize Old Catholic tendencies where they seemed to move in directions which he was unable to approve. For nearly forty years he worked to promote union between Old Catholics and the East with unflagging zeal and energy, which even the blindness with which his closing days were afflicted could not quench.

V

Kiréeff's opinion of the English Church may be partly anticipated from his attitude toward other types of corporate Christianity.⁶

¹ "L'ancien-Catholicisme," p. 235.

² *Ibid.*, p. 236.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 198.

⁴ "Lettres," p. 34.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 337.

⁶ "L'ancien-Catholicisme," p. 229.

The Anglican Church impresses him as producing a learned clergy, of whom some are greatly appreciated in Russia. But it is curiously suggestive that the names on which he lays chief stress are Stanley and Farrar.¹

Up to the present time, he says, the idea of union between the Orthodox and the Anglicans has bristled with difficulties; chiefly because the Easterns regard Anglicans through Roman glasses. He means that legends like the "Nag's Head" and other such stories distorted fact and obscured the truth from them.²

But coming to facts, there are the XXXIX. Articles. Kiréeff is ready to recognize that they arose out of special circumstances. But, he asks, why should they be permanently imposed? Dogma, to which the Church is committed, is not of a temporary character, but unchangeable.³ Indeed, the XXXIX. Articles have largely lost their value through the interpretations which many Anglicans have given them. Taken literally they present to the Eastern an insurmountable difficulty. Subjected to an explanatory process, the case is otherwise. But clearly Kiréeff cannot understand what value can belong to documents interpreted in "a new and larger" meaning.

And this leads him to the fundamental obstacle to reunion between the East and the English Church. It is the Anglican tendency toward the spirit of compromise.⁴ Compromise, in Kiréeff's opinion, is often necessary in politics, but absolutely unlawful in religion. Churches are not the masters of the Faith, but only the trustees and guardians of it. Consequently, so regarded, the whole notion of compromising the Truth is nothing less than a steward's unfaithfulness.

"We Easterns," wrote Kiréeff, "sincerely desire to come to an understanding with the great Anglican Church; but this happy result cannot be attained at once and unless the Anglican Church herself becomes homogeneous and the doctrines of her different constituent parts become identical."⁵

On the other hand Kiréeff, instructed by Döllinger, had a clear belief in the validity of Anglican ordination.

VI

In estimating Kiréeff's opinions aright it must of course be remembered that his view of Anglicanism was that which commonly prevailed among educated Russians in the period before the War. He died before those dreadful tragedies had altered the state of things, sweeping many a prejudice away, revising many an estimate, broadening many an outlook, creating new sympathies, and strengthening the desire to reunite.

¹ "Lettres," p. 20.

² "L'ancien-Catholicisme," p. 28.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 229.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 230.

⁵ "L'ancien-Catholicisme," p. 224.

Kiréeff's longing for Reunion was in many respects in advance of the majority of his contemporaries, while it was also restrained unconsciously within certain unessential but traditional customs and limitations. It is not perhaps difficult to imagine what line this distinguished Russian churchman would adopt were he living in England at the present day and acting in the light of recent experiences. Readers of his articles, strewn through the twenty volumes of that most valuable periodical now called the *Revue Internationale des Eglises*, also of his collected papers, and above all of his letters, will have found themselves in the companionship of a single-minded, gifted, and attractive personality animated by one consuming passion: the honour of Christ and the reunion of the Church. It is an example which may furnish inspiration to laymen of a later day.

A FEW WORDS ABOUT THE CHURCH OF RUMANIA

By MADAME ROMALO

THE Orthodox Church of Rumania was at the height of her culture and influence in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In spite of Turkish suzerainty, which, though extorting ample revenues from the tributary country, kept disdainfully aloof from mixing in religious questions, and did not interfere with the free practice of the Christian religion, the epoch was rich in learned and saintly prelates, to whose writings the Orthodox Church in the East owes much of her culture, and who helped to seal immutably the doctrines of the Orthodox faith, strengthening it against the often renewed attempts of proselytizing from the Roman Catholics and Protestants.

Pious princes and nobles at that time were building monasteries and churches that even to-day remain the most beautiful architectural treasures of the country. Rich gifts of estates accompanied these establishments, enabling the Church to found monastery schools which for centuries were the only ones in the country. Unfortunately, many of the donors were animated by the most enthusiastic devotion for the holy places, fountain-heads of their religion: such as the Monastery of the Holy Mountain Athos, the Churches of Jerusalem and Constantinople; and they transferred the land and the revenues of their religious endowments to these sanctuaries abroad.

This alienating of Rumanian lands and possessions to the benefit of foreign institutions may have hastened the confiscation of Church property. It spread slowly with the infiltration of the philosophic and

materialistic theories coming from the West, especially from France, at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The Government preferred to use the income of the ecclesiastical estates for the needs of the country itself instead of allowing it to be taken to Greece and Constantinople, where at that time, between 1815 and 1821, it was spent for Greek patriotic propaganda work, which sometimes was directed against Rumanian interests. In 1860, the last Prince of Rumanian nationality, Cuza-Voda, abruptly secularized the remaining ecclesiastical properties, and the impoverished and helpless Church was henceforth put under Government control and became a department of the State under the Ministry of Education. Lay schools were being built and two Universities were founded, and the interest and outlay occasioned by these new institutions caused the Church to be little by little crowded into the background, and the clergy began to settle down into ill-paid drudgery, disdainfully tolerated by the "enlightened" Government as a necessary concession to the superstitions of the people. The masses of the clergy had never been either educated or conscious of the high calling entrusted to them, and though the Ministry provided them with two seminaries, and later with two Faculties of Theology, the professors in the institutions being mostly secular and openly indifferent to the Christian Faith, the latter state of the priests became worse than the first.

From being a Government department the Church soon became a political instrument, and the election of the higher clergy was decided by party interests. The most deserving were not elected to the episcopal Sees, but those most protected by the party in power. Holiness and wisdom were at a discount, and flattery and intrigue won the day as never before. The lower ranks of the clergy, miserably underpaid and overworked, lost all faith in justice and right, and tried to scramble for a better living by every possible means, so as to be able to bring up their children more or less decently.

The course at the ecclesiastical seminaries is divided into eight classes; having passed through these, the students are ordained and become village priests without further instruction, whereas the town priests are obliged to pass through the Universities, after which some of the most able among them are sent to the Theological Faculties of Moscow, Czernovitz, or Athens, where they become wise in doctrine and theology, but remain barren in spirit. The few who went to Liepzig, though returning with their minds still better furnished with exegesis and critical studies, priding themselves on their modern standpoint, certainly did not contribute to the spiritual revival of the Church.

To-day many of the laymen and many of the clerics, conscious of the wonderful heritage enshrined in their Church, are deeply dissatis-

fied with the existing circumstances, and are groping for light. The treasure is hidden, locked up, and they want it brought to light.

The consequence of this longing for a better spiritual state is that some members of the well-educated classes, especially among women, who feel the emptiness of their lives, and, ignorant of their religion, do not love it, turn to the Roman Catholics, because their priests can help them to find moral strength in times of distress.

And yet to those who know the Orthodox Church, the beauties contained in her teaching cannot be surpassed. Nearly identical to the Greek and Russian, the Rumanian Liturgy is one of the most beautiful services of worship, intercession, and adoration. But the remnant of the church-going population do not understand it. Though held in the Rumanian language, the service, until lately, has been generally read in the nasal chant prescribed by very ancient canons, and the careless enunciation of the old clergy contributed to make it quite incomprehensible.

The younger priests were energetic enough to break with this useless and harmful tradition. In most urban churches the service is now chanted clearly and with dignified respect, and the richer parishes have the additional advantage of good choirs. A larger congregation is attracted to some of the more favoured churches; people go conscientiously through all the outward forms of worship, and more respectfully than in former years, but the spirit is not stirred. The clergy themselves sometimes remind one of a child holding a precious gem and bewilderingly turning it round and round, not knowing what use to make of it.

The Church could have benefited more than it did by the reign of the first King of Rumania, Charles I., from 1866-1915, if he had been a member of it. A wise and conscientious Sovereign, he was a Roman Catholic, and his wife, Queen Elizabeth, a Lutheran. Both good Christians and spiritually minded, they were debarred through their alien religion from taking more than an official interest in the Orthodox Church. The King and Queen showed every respect for the religious institutions, following, as sovereigns, the customs of the national Church, but they tactfully refrained from countenancing any missionary work, however helpful it might have been. They knew that the raw susceptibilities of a clergy, which through the centuries had to repulse many proselytizing attempts, would immediately take alarm and stubbornly refuse even the most useful and helpful suggestions. This blind devotion to the traditions of their religion, which at present is a serious drawback, has nevertheless saved the Orthodox Faith in Rumania from every alien element.

The peasants, who form the bulk of the population, are fanatically attached to their religion, and do not consider as Christians those of

another Faith. They conscientiously follow every precept of the Church, and consider it a greater sin not to keep the forty days' fast before Easter than to steal his neighbour's goods. They love the ceremonials of their Church without understanding, and they piously dream through the two-hour-long Sunday service in which no sermon is preached.

They may be unfortunate enough to have an unworthy priest in their village whom they thoroughly despise on weekdays, but on Sundays they respectfully listen to the Mass held by him, and kiss his hand when he presents them the Cross, and anoints their foreheads at the end of the service. God is to them a very shadowy conception; Jesus Christ is worshipped rather from a distance and in utter ignorance; but they feel at home with their Saints—SS. Nicholas and Dimitri, Basil and Grigori, and especially the Holy Virgin. They burn candles before their shrines; pray to them in distress; take the clothes of the sick to the holy images to be blessed by the priest; and very scrupulously keep the feasts of the Saints.

The latter religious manifestation is also very popular in the schools, where every month brings at least one holiday to the delighted children. In the villages they go to church on those days; in towns they go to the pictures.

However depressing the outlook may be, yet it is not hopeless.

For decades the Church has lived in religious barrenness, but not in religious chaos. She has held fast to the pure doctrine of the Apostolic Fathers, which through the centuries have been numbered, weighed, and not found wanting.

Those who care to listen can hear the living water flowing under the thick crust of worldliness, indifference, and neglect, which has accumulated more and more since the Church has been under secular control.

We long to see the Spirit released, to see new life poured into the enfeebled organism, and we confidently look to the country where the fight for the Living Spirit is gaining more and more strength—to Great Britain. And we hope to see our young priests learning in England to practise the fruitful and dignified service of religious life.

A LETTER TO THE RUSSIAN RULERS, 1918

BY THE PATRIARCH TYKHON

"They that take up the sword shall perish by the sword."—MATT. xxvi. 52.

THIS prophecy of Christ we address unto you, the present rulers of the destinies of our country, styling yourselves "the people's commissaries." For a year you are holding the State power in your hands, and are preparing to celebrate the anniversary of the October revolution, but the torrents of blood of your brothers, mercilessly killed at your bidding, compels us to speak unto you the bitter word of truth.

In seizing power and inviting the people to place their confidence in you, what did you promise them, and how did you fulfil your promise?

Verily, you have given them a stone instead of bread, and a serpent in place of fish (Matt. vii. 9-10).

You promised to a people worn out by sanguinary war to give them peace "without annexations and indemnities."

What conquests could you renounce: you, who have brought Russia to a shameful peace, the humiliating conditions of which even you dare not fully publish? In place of annexations and contributions, our great Motherland herself is conquered, humiliated, and dismembered, and in payment of war tribute you are secretly conveying to Germany the gold which you have not assembled.

You have robbed the fighting men of all they lately gallantly fought for. You have taught those who a short while ago were brave and invincible to give up the defence of their country and flee from the battlefield. You have quenched in their hearts the inspiring consciousness that "greater love hath no man than this, to lay down his life for his friend." You have substituted for the Motherland a soulless Internationale, although you yourselves know full well that where the defence of their native country was concerned the proletarians of all lands were its loyal sons and not traitors. Having refused to defend your country against external foes, you are nevertheless continually organizing troops.

Against whom are you leading them? You have divided the whole people into enemy camps, and have hurled them into fratricide unheard of for its cruelty. You have openly exchanged the love of Christ for hatred, and instead of giving peace have artificially kindled class war. And there seems no end to the war originated by you, for

you aspire by the hands of Russian workers and peasants to bring about the triumph of the phantom of the world revolution.

It was not Russia who needed the shameful peace with the external enemy, but you in your desire to break completely our internal peace. Nobody feels safe; all live in constant fear of requisition, robbery, arrest, execution; hundreds of defenceless people are seized daily, and lie for months rotting in foul prisons, are executed without investigation or trial, even with the simplified method of trial established by you. Not only are those executed who are found guilty towards you, but also those whom you well know to be innocent, and who were merely taken as "hostages"; these unfortunate people are killed out of vengeance for crimes committed, not by their relatives or friends, but frequently by your own adherents or by persons sympathizing with your own views. Innocent bishops, priests, monks, and nuns, are shot on a wholesale, vague, and indefinite accusation of "counter-revolution." This inhuman existence is made still harder for the Orthodox believers by their being bereft of the last consolation before death, the taking of the Holy Communion, and by the bodies of those slain being refused to their relatives for Christian burial.

Does not all this represent the culmination of aimless cruelty on the part of those who pose as the benefactors of humanity, and have themselves, as they say, suffered much from cruel authorities?

But you are not content with having smeared the hands of the Russian people with the blood of their brethren: by concealing it under different terms, such as contributions, requisitions, nationalizations, you have pushed them towards the most open and shameless robbery. You have incited them to destroy and seize the land, farms, works, factories, houses, cattle; to loot money, furniture, clothes. At first wealthy people were robbed on the pretence of their being "bourgeois"; then hard-working and well-to-do peasants, because they were supposed to be "kulaki"; thus increasing the number of paupers, although you cannot but know that by ruining multitudes of private citizens you are destroying national wealth and ruining the country. By tempting the obscure and ignorant people with the possibility of easily acquired loot, you have befogged their conscience and dulled the consciousness of sin; but whatever names you give to iniquities, murder, aggression, and rapine will always remain a heavy sin and crime, crying out to Heaven for vengeance.

You have promised liberty.

Great is the gift of liberty, if it is rightly understood as freedom from evil, which does not oppress others, does not merge into aggression or self-will. But that is the liberty which you did not give: your liberty consists in encouraging the evil passions of the mob, in leaving murders and pillage unpunished. All manifestations either

of true civic or of the higher spiritual freedom have been ruthlessly suppressed.

Is that liberty when no one dares to obtain food for himself, to change one's dwelling, to move from town to town? Is that liberty when families and sometimes all the inhabitants of a house are evicted and their property thrown out into the street, and when all citizens are artificially divided into categories, of which some are destined to famine and plunder? Is that liberty when no one dares to state openly one's opinion out of fear of being accused of counter-revolution? Where are freedom of speech and of the Press? Where the freedom of church-preaching? Have not many brave church-preachers already paid the price of their blood, the blood of martyrs? The voice of social and State discussion is suppressed; the Press, with the exception of the narrow pro-Bolshevist section, is completely strangled.

Particularly hard and cruel is the suppression of liberty and faith. Not a day passes but the most monstrous calumnies against the Church of God, angry blasphemy and sacrilege, appear in your Press. You mock the servants of the Church, you force bishops to dig trenches (Hermogen, Bishop of Tobolsk), and set priests to perform the meanest tasks. You have laid your hand upon the inheritance of the Church, gathered together by generations of the faithful, and have not hesitated to violate their last will and testament. You have closed monasteries and chapels for no cause or reason whatsoever. You have closed the entrance to the Moscow Kremlin, that sanctuary of the people. You have destroyed the old order of Church community; you are suppressing the brotherhoods and other philanthropic and educational institutions; you disperse Church and diocesan meetings, interfere with the internal affairs of the Orthodox Church; you evict sacred images from the schools; and, by forbidding religious teaching, you deprive the children of the spiritual nourishment so indispensable to a Christian upbringing.

"And what shall I more say? For the time would fail me" (Heb. xi. 32) to describe all the calamities which have befallen our Mother-country. I will not speak of the disruption of the once mighty Russia, of the complete disorganization of transport, of the unheard-of disruption of the food-supply, of the cold and famine which threaten to bring death to the towns, of the absence of all necessities in the villages. That is patent to all eyes. Yea, we are passing through terrible times, and the memory of your power will remain for a long time uneffaced out of the people's soul, for in it you have darkened the image of God and imprinted that of the beast. The words of the prophet are being realized: "Their feet run into evil, and they make haste to shed innocent blood: their thoughts are thoughts of iniquity, wasting and destruction are in their path" (Isa. lix. 7).

We know that our denunciations will only kindle your wrath and indignation, that you will only seek in them a pretext for accusing us of defiance of your authority, but as the "pillar of your wrath" rises ever higher, the greater will be the evidence of the justice of our denunciations.

It is not our business to judge of earthly powers: any power tolerated by God would receive our blessing, if it appeared as "the judgment of God" for the good of the people, and was "not a terror to good works, but to the evil" (Rom. xiii. 3).

But now unto you, who use your power for persecution of your brethren and the extermination of the innocent, we tender our word of persuasion: Celebrate the anniversary of your coming into power by liberating the prisoners, by ceasing bloodshed, aggression, ruin, persecution of the Faith; turn from destruction towards the restoration of law and order; give the people the longed-for and merited rest from civil war. But now the blood of the righteous which you have shed shall be required of you (Luke xi. 51), "and you that have taken the sword shall perish by the sword" (Matt. xxvi. 52).

(Signed) TYKHON,

Patriarch of Moscow and all Russia.

NOTES ON RECENT EVENTS

Ecclesiastike Aletheia, the official organ of the Œcumenical Patriarchate, announces that Germanos, Metropolitan of Amaseia, and Professor P. Comnenos, of the Halki Theological Academy, will come to England in July as an official delegation to the Lambeth Conference from the *locum tenens* of the Œcumenical Throne and the Holy Synod of the Great Church of Constantinople. The Protosphyriar Callinicos of the Greek Church in Manchester is designated as their colleague on account of his intimate knowledge of the English language and of English life. Of these, the Metropolitan of Amaseia (the metropolitanate is titular) is one of the great personages at the Phanar, and is the chairman of the permanent committee recently set up by the Holy Synod to promote relations with the Anglican Churches. The calling into being of this Committee is itself significant, since it is analogous to our own Archbishop's Committee on the Eastern Churches and to the committee appointed by the Metropolitan of Athens. At the same time it marks a great advance in our relations with the Orthodox since hitherto Anglican affairs have been referred to a committee of the Holy Synod which dealt with "other Christian bodies," and of which Bryennios, Metropolitan of Nicomedia, the discoverer of Clement II. and the Diqache, was the first chairman. The Metropolitan of Amaseia bears the name of a sound theologian, an acute statesman, a strong Anglophile, and an attractive personality. Apart from his mission his visit

would be noteworthy. Professor Comnenos is a man of great ability and wide outlook, and did fine work at Robert College, the famous American institution on the Bosphorus, before going to Halki, which is the Patriarchal Seminary and at which practically every bishop of the Greek Churches has been trained or has resided. The Archimandrite Callinicos is well known to a large circle in England where he has resided for fourteen years. Up to 1906 he was one of the clergy attached to the Patriarchal Church in the Phanar. A more sympathetic personnel, or a more dignified, could not have been chosen for the delegation.



The extraordinary importance of this proposed delegation will be evident from the fact that since Florence, in 1438, there has been no precedent for such a mark of comity and amity as a ceremonial visit from the (Ecumenical Patriarchate to a Western Church. The past year, indeed, has witnessed several Eastern Orthodox prelates taking part in intercession and thanksgiving services in our London cathedrals. Thus the heads of two Autocephalous Churches, the Metropolitan of Athens and the Archbishop of Cyprus did so in St. Paul's, and the Metropolitan of Trebizond attended at St. Saviour's when the Armenian Patriarch Zaven, of Constantinople, and the Syrian Archbishop Barsawn were also present. Bishop Velimirovic preached the first sermon ever preached by other than an Anglican in St. Paul's Cathedral and has been assailed therefor by the Romans for an act of "Communicatio in Concione." All these, however, and others such as Zeremsky, Vicar-General of Carlowitz, who have fraternized with us, were in England on private or political business, and were here unofficially so far as the English Church is concerned. The expected delegation, however, is being sent in answer to the official letter of invitation, sent by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the *locum tenens* of the Ecumenical Throne. This letter, which we publish on p. 57, was received at the Phanar with great ceremony, the Holy Synod adjourning and ordering a service to be held in every church in Constantinople on the following Sunday. The Archimandrite Dionysios, Chief Secretary at the Phanar, makes an enthusiastic reference to the Archbishop's letter: "This event further raises the English Church in the eyes of the Orthodox, and makes us confident that reunion will come about more easily with this Church in spite of existing differences than with any other Church in spite of existing agreements."



Bishop Velimirovic has lately been making a tour of the Autocephalous Churches on behalf of the Holy Synod of Serbia. It is, of course, the rule that no Autocephalous Church alters the existing customs of the Eastern Orthodox Church without consulting the others. As a result of the war many of the Serb secular clergy find themselves widowed. In consequence the Serbians wish the rule which forbids their second marriage suspended. Bishop Velimirovic has accordingly been chosen to lay the matter before the Ecumenical Patriarchate and other Autocephalous Churches.

His Beatitude Saghat II., Catholicos of Sis (the capital of Cilicia), the second personage in the Orthodox Armenian Church, spent a fortnight in England after the publication of the San Remo terms. His Holiness, who is seventy-two years of age, was born at Harput. Educated at the Armenian Monastery in Jerusalem, he was ordained priest there in 1877, and in 1889 was consecrated at Etchmiadsin to be Bishop in Jerusalem—i.e., as the assistant of the Armenian Patriarch of Jerusalem. In that capacity he came in contact with Bishop Wordsworth of Salisbury, and other Anglican travellers. He speaks only Turkish and his own tongue. In 1902 he was elected Catholicos of Sis, and had ruled there over the Armenians of Cilicia, or Little Armenia, until the war broke out. Cilicia has, of course, been the chief massacre spot in all Turkey. Abdul Hamid conducted great pogroms there. The massacre organized by the Young Turks at Adana in 1908 will never be forgotten. Zeitun, with its imperishable memories of centuries of refusal to submit to the Turks is also in the Catholicate. The worst of the atrocities in the Great War were perpetrated in Cilicia. Mgr. Saghat was exiled first to Harput, then taken to Jerusalem, thence to Damascus, and after three years of continuous peril liberated at the Armistice. Since 1918 Cilicia has been the theatre of renewed and repeated massacres, there being still grave danger that the last of its Armenians will be extirpated. Sis itself, like Zeitun, is in ruins. The ancient patriarchal Church of St. Sophia at Sis, restored 110 years ago, has been converted to Turkish use, the famous marble throne of the Catholicos, said to have been that of Leo, the last king of independent Armenia, has been deliberately destroyed, and with it priceless MSS. and relics. Cilicia is, of course, now under the French mandate.



The death of Dr. Ronald Burrows, of King's College, at the relatively early age of fifty-three, will bring a sense of deep loss to all who are interested in Eastern Christianity. Dr. Burrows' work as a Philhellene and a friend of the lesser Slav nations is known to all the world. Serbia, Poland, and Czecho-Slovakia will never forget the debt they owe him. He was also intensely interested in the Eastern Orthodox Church, and on account of his first-hand knowledge of the Near East and personal friendship with M. Venizelos, was placed by the Archbishop of Canterbury on the Committee for Promoting Relations with the Eastern Churches. If he had lived he would have been a valued assistant to the Lambeth Committee on the Eastern Orthodox Church. The part that he took in voicing the demand for the Redemption of St. Sophia is well known to the general public: the discourse of Greeks at his funeral and the eloquent oration delivered by M. Caclamanos, the Greek Minister, at a special meeting of the Greek community held in the vestry of St. Sophia, Ragswater, on the same day. His Excellency then declared that the death of their friend had cast a shadow over the whole Greek nation in the hour of the realization of its most cherished hopes. In truth, work such as Dr. Burrows' is undoubtedly the best preparation for reunion with the Near East. No one could doubt his enthusiasm or disinterestedness. Our cause is greatly the poorer for his death. R.I.P.

would be noteworthy. Professor Comnenos is a man of great ability and wide outlook, and did fine work at Robert College, the famous American institution on the Bosphorus, before going to Halki, which is the Patriarchal Seminary and at which practically every bishop of the Greek Churches has been trained or has resided. The Archimandrite Callinicos is well known to a large circle in England where he has resided for fourteen years. Up to 1906 he was one of the clergy attached to the Patriarchal Church in the Phanar. A more sympathetic personnel, or a more dignified, could not have been chosen for the delegation.



The extraordinary importance of this proposed delegation will be evident from the fact that since Florence, in 1438, there has been no precedent for such a mark of comity and amity as a ceremonial visit from the Œcumenical Patriarchate to a Western Church. The past year, indeed, has witnessed several Eastern Orthodox prelates taking part in intercession and thanksgiving services in our London cathedrals. Thus the heads of two Autocephalous Churches, the Metropolitan of Athens and the Archbishop of Cyprus did so in St. Paul's, and the Metropolitan of Trebizond attended at St. Saviour's when the Armenian Patriarch Zaven, of Constantinople, and the Syrian Archbishop Barsawm were also present. Bishop Velimirovic preached the first sermon ever preached by other than an Anglican in St. Paul's Cathedral and has been assailed therefor by the Romans for an act of "Communicatio in Concione." All these, however, and others such as Zeremsky, Vicar-General of Carlowitz, who have fraternized with us, were in England on private or political business, and were here unofficially so far as the English Church is concerned. The expected delegation, however, is being sent in answer to the official letter of invitation, sent by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the *locum tenens* of the Œcumenical Throne. This letter, which we publish on p. 57, was received at the Phanar with great ceremony, the Holy Synod adjourning and ordering a service to be held in every church in Constantinople on the following Sunday. The Archimandrite Dionysios, Chief Secretary at the Phanar, makes an enthusiastic reference to the Archbishop's letter: "This event further raises the English Church in the eyes of the Orthodox, and makes us confident that reunion will come about more easily with this Church in spite of existing differences than with any other Church in spite of existing agreements."



Bishop Velimirovic has lately been making a tour of the Autocephalous Churches on behalf of the Holy Synod of Serbia. It is, of course, the rule that no Autocephalous Church alters the existing customs of the Eastern Orthodox Church without consulting the others. As a result of the war many of the Serb secular clergy find themselves widowed. In consequence the Serbians wish the rule which forbids their second marriage suspended. Bishop Velimirovic has accordingly been chosen to lay the matter before the Œcumenical Patriarchate and other Autocephalous Churches.

His Beatitude Saghat II., Catholicos of Sis (the capital of Cilicia), the second personage in the Orthodox Armenian Church, spent a fortnight in England after the publication of the San Remo terms. His Holiness, who is seventy-two years of age, was born at Harput. Educated at the Armenian Monastery in Jerusalem, he was ordained priest there in 1877, and in 1889 was consecrated at Etchmiadsin to be Bishop in Jerusalem—*i.e.*, as the assistant of the Armenian Patriarch of Jerusalem. In that capacity he came in contact with Bishop Wordsworth of Salisbury, and other Anglican travellers. He speaks only Turkish and his own tongue. In 1902 he was elected Catholicos of Sis, and had ruled there over the Armenians of Cilicia, or Little Armenia, until the war broke out. Cilicia has, of course, been the chief massacre spot in all Turkey. Abdul Hamid conducted great pogroms there. The massacre organized by the Young Turks at Adana in 1908 will never be forgotten. Zeitun, with its imperishable memories of centuries of refusal to submit to the Turks is also in the Catholicate. The worst of the atrocities in the Great War were perpetrated in Cilicia. Mgr. Saghat was exiled first to Harput, then taken to Jerusalem, thence to Damascus, and after three years of continuous peril liberated at the Armistice. Since 1918 Cilicia has been the theatre of renewed and repeated massacres, there being still grave danger that the last of its Armenians will be extirpated. Sis itself, like Zeitun, is in ruins. The ancient patriarchal Church of St. Sophia at Sis, restored 110 years ago, has been converted to Turkish use, the famous marble throne of the Catholicos, said to have been that of Leo, the last king of independent Armenia, has been deliberately destroyed, and with it priceless MSS. and relics. Cilicia is, of course, now under the French mandate.



The death of Dr. Ronald Burrows, of King's College, at the relatively early age of fifty-three, will bring a sense of deep loss to all who are interested in Eastern Christianity. Dr. Burrows' work as a Philhellene and a friend of the lesser Slav nations is known to all the world. Serbia, Poland, and Czecho-Slovakia will never forget the debt they owe him. He was also intensely interested in the Eastern Orthodox Church, and on account of his first-hand knowledge of the Near East and personal friendship with M. Venizelos, was placed by the Archbishop of Canterbury on the Committee for Promoting Relations with the Eastern Churches. If he had lived he would have been a valued assistant to the Lambeth Committee on the Eastern Orthodox Church. The part that he took in voicing the demand for the Redemption of St. Sophia is well known to the general public: the concourse of Greeks at his funeral and the eloquent oration delivered by M. Caclamanos, the Greek Minister, at a special meeting of the Greek community held in the vestry of St. Sophia, Bayswater, on the same day. His Excellency then declared that the death of their friend had cast a shadow over the whole Greek nation in the hour of the realization of its most cherished hopes. In truth, work such as Dr. Burrows' is undoubtedly the best preparation for reunion with the Near East. No one could doubt his enthusiasm or disinterestedness. Our cause is greatly the poorer for his death. R.I.P.

REVIEWS

SOME BOOKS ON ARMENIA

Those who desire to know more of the history of that afflicted race will find such information in a book published last year by J. Laurent, of the University of Nancy, entitled "*L'Arménie entre Byzance et l'Islam depuis la conquête arabe jusqu'en 886.*" It is a record of great learning, and throws much light on early relations between the Turk and the Armenian people.

A very sensational volume is the "Secrets of the Bosphorus," by Henry Morgenthau, who was American Ambassador at Constantinople during the memorable years 1913-1916. It takes a most appalling view of German influence.

"A History of the Armenian Church" was written by E. F. K. Fortescue, with an appendix by S. C. Malan. This was published in 1872, but is still of value. There is also the quite recent book by Malachia Ormanian, formerly Armenian Patriarch at Constantinople: "*The Church of Armenia, her History, Doctrine, Rule, Discipline, Liturgy, Literature, and Existing Conditions.*" This was originally written in French. The English translation is published by Mowbray, 1912.

Diehl's "*Byzance, Grandeur et Décadence,*" should also be read in connection with these.

But, above all, no one who is concerned to realize the facts of the massacres can omit to read what is one of the most dreadful records ever set before the Government of the English nation, the Blue book "*Miscellaneous, No. 31 (1916), on the Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, 1915-16.*" Documents presented to Viscount Grey of Falloden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, by Viscount Bryce" (price 2s.).

A more heartrending record of agonies was never penned than this dreadful Government Report. Armenian Bishops have been hanged, apparently for no other crime than that of being Armenian and Christian. And what makes it yet more terrible is that these massacres have reached a magnitude unprecedented in the annals of mankind. For surely it is true that never before have nearly a million human beings been mercilessly slaughtered wholesale at one time.

Take, for instance, some fragment of a letter sent by four members of the German Missions Staff in Turkey to the Minister of Foreign Affairs at Berlin, asking "if it is really beyond the power of the German Government to mitigate the brutality of the treatment which the exiled women and children of the massacred Armenians are receiving. In face of the scenes of horror which are being unfolded daily before our eyes in the neighbourhood of our school our educational activity becomes a mockery of humanity."¹ "Out of 2,000 to 3,000 peasant women from the Armenian Plateau who were brought here in good health, only forty or fifty skeletons are left"; emaciated living skeletons, the writers mean, while "Europeans are forbidden to distribute bread to the starving." "The German scutcheon is in danger of being smirched for ever in the memory of the Near Eastern peoples." "The responsible authorities fear the light, but have no intention of putting an end to scenes which are a disgrace to humanity."²

Now the Turks themselves do not deny the facts. Indeed, they attempt to justify them. And the attempted justification is: first, that the Armenians took up arms and joined the Russians;³ secondly, that there was a general conspiracy of Armenians throughout the empire to bring about an internal revolution, at the very moment when all the Ottoman military forces were engaged on the frontiers, and so deliver the country into the hands of the Allies;⁴ thirdly, it was a justifiable act of retaliation and revenge.⁵

¹ Documents, p. xxxiii.

² *Ib.* p. xxxiv.

³ P. 627.

⁴ P. 629.

⁵ P. 630.

These three contentions are all denied by competent witnesses. But even if they were all true they can never justify the wholesale extermination indiscriminately of the guilty and innocent in circumstances of unutterable barbarity.

And if it were possible to make things worse, here is what a Turkish leader openly contended. "He laid all the fault of it on the ancestors of the modern Turks, who, in spite of their being victorious and defying all Europe—nay, all the world—had not been far-sighted enough to cleanse all the country they ruled of the Christian element, but had yielded to their chivalrous feelings and allowed the Christians to live. Had the Turks done this bit of cleaning up at a time when nobody could protest, there would have been an easy task now for the heads of the Turkish Government."¹

But there is even more than this, if we may credit an extract quoted from, perhaps, the ablest propagator in Europe of Pan-German ideas, Friedrich Naumann. What he maintained was this:

"If we should take into consideration merely the violent massacre of from 80,000 to 100,000 Armenians, we can come to but one opinion. We must absolutely condemn, with all anger and vehemence, both the assassins and their instigators." But, he continues, the Turk is fighting for his existence. "We believe, despite the indignation which this barbarism arouses in us, that the Turks are defending themselves legitimately; and, before anything else, we see in the Armenian question and Armenian massacres a matter of internal Turkish policy; merely an episode of the agony through which a great empire is passing, which does not propose to let itself die without making a last attempt to save itself by bloodshed."² "Just as little as the ancient Roman state could tolerate the Nazarene's religion, just as little can the Turkish Empire tolerate any representation of Western free Christianity among its subjects. The danger for Turkey in the Armenian question is one of extinction. For this reason she resorts to an act of a barbarous Asiatic state; she has destroyed the Armenians to such an extent that they will not be able to manifest themselves as a political force for a considerable period. A horrible act, certainly, an act of political despair, shameful in its details, but still a piece of political history, in the Asiatic manner. . . . In spite of the displeasure which the German Christian feels at these accomplished facts, he has nothing to do except quietly to heal the wounds so far as he can, and then to let matters take their course. For a long time our policy in the Orient has been determined; we belong to the group that protects Turkey, that is the fact by which we must regulate our conduct. . . . We do not prohibit any zealous Christian from caring for the victims of these horrible crimes, from bringing up the children and nursing the adults. May God bless these good acts, like all other acts of faith." Only we must take care that acts of charity do not take the form of political acts which are likely to thwart our German policy."

As long ago as 1896 Dr. Lepsius, of Berlin, wrote an impassioned protest against the Turkish treatment of Christians in a book called "Armenia and Europe," which was translated into English and edited by Dr. Rendel Harris.

Dr. Lepsius asked: "What is to become of the six hundred to a thousand villages that have been forcibly converted to Islam? What of the hundreds of Christian churches that now serve as mosques? . . . What do the Powers intend to do to save the honour of Christendom from the triumph of Islam? It is not our business to give an answer to this question, but we call upon the heart of Christian emperors and kings, that they bear not the sword of God in vain. We must remind them that they are the representatives of Divine justice upon earth, and are accountable for keeping in view the honour of God and the Kingdom of Christ in the exercise of their difficult office. We know that One, higher than all the great Christian powers,

¹ Report, p. 18.

² Quoted in Morgenthau, p. 242.

lives and rules the destiny of the world, but it has pleased Him to choose human instruments to fulfil His will upon earth. May they not prove incompetent?" (pp. 152-153).

Dr. Rendel Harris, in an introductory letter to the English translation of this book, wrote: "I cannot but hope that in England all your words will carry conviction amongst a wide margin of indifferent or ill-informed persons, and hasten the day when we shall be prepared in common to abolish the foulest tyranny that gehennizes (forgive the creation of a necessary word) the world in which we can only truly live accordingly as we live in turn brotherly and freely."

The massacres against which Dr. Lepsius protested were numerically insignificant compared with the scale on which the same awful method has been recently carried out. The gloomy foreboding in 1896 was: "Whole civilizations may be blotted out, and churches which have stood for centuries disappear." It is appalling to think of the degree to which that foreboding has already been realized.

The Eucharist in India. A Plea for a Distinctive Liturgy for the Indian Church, with a suggested form by J. C. Winslow, D. R. Athavale, J. E. G. Festing, E. C. Ratcliff, with a preface by the Bishop of Bombay. (Longmans, 1920.)

Those who are interested in Prayer Book revision ought to study these pages. It is no news to many that the Anglican Communion Office has proved inadequate to the needs of the Churches of China and Japan. What is contended in the volume before us is the inadequacy of the same Office for the Church in India. What is proposed is that a modification of an Eastern liturgy would be far more appropriate to the requirements of Indian devotion. The Office here suggested is a free adaptation of the liturgy of the Syrian Church, very much abbreviated indeed, but containing the main features of an exceedingly beautiful rite.

In its broad outlines this suggested Office is identical with almost all the liturgies of the East. "To take but one instance, the invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the offered gifts (which the compilers of the Scottish and American liturgies have wisely incorporated) is regarded in the East as the culminating moment of the Consecration, and is marked as such in the liturgy printed in this book by the prostration of the people in adoration. The association of the act of consecration only with the priest's repetition of our Lord's words of institution, as in the Anglican rite, almost inevitably conveys the suggestion of a magic formula, whereas the prayer to the Holy Spirit to sanctify the gifts to our use is free from this suggestion."¹

Then again in this proposed liturgy, "as in almost all the liturgies of Christendom, there is far more reference to our Lord's Sacrifice upon the Cross, and to our 'offering' of that sacrifice before the Father, than in our Anglican rite.² We would plea," continues the writer, "that this is of special value and importance in a land where sacrifices form a constant feature of the ordinary worship and sacrificial language is an integral part of the religious phraseology. But also we would urge that this aspect of the Eucharist is so essential a part of its true meaning that it cannot be omitted without serious loss."³

The writer maintains that "if the Cross of Christ . . . stands out as the 'full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice,' it is in the Eucharist above all that we 'offer' or present that sacrifice before God the Father. It has always seemed to the present writer that the objection felt in some quarters to the ancient and world-wide language of the liturgy, about offering the Eucharistic sacrifice, rests upon a misunderstanding of the meaning of the word 'offer.' The sacrificial 'offering' is not the actual slaying of the victim, but the presentation before the Higher Power, however conceived, of the victim already slain. . . . In the offering of the

¹ P. 11.² P. 14.³ P. 15.

Eucharist there is not, and cannot be, any such thought as that the sacrifice of Calvary is *repeated*, that Christ is again *slain* (though doubtless language has often been used which lent colour to such a notion); but, rather, we there present before the Father the sacrifice then once for all offered for the sins of the whole world."¹

This proposal to introduce into Indian devotion another form of Eucharistic Office is prefaced by the Bishop of Bombay, who, after pointing out carefully its tentative character, faces the very interesting question, What is the value and justification of uniformity? The endeavour to enforce liturgical uniformity so far as the Eucharist is concerned has been characteristically Anglican as well as Roman. But what is the worth of this insistence?

The value of uniformity consists principally in the fact that it is a symbol of unity. We speak alike because we think alike. But, says the Bishop, "an act is not justified simply because it is symbolic of something good and true."² And the drawback of confining all Eucharistic utterances within the bonds of a rigid uniformity is that it leaves no room for the variety which a real unity must include.

Of course if any one liturgy were ideally perfect, representing all that worshippers ought to feel, and representing it in the best conceivable way, then its universal enforcement might be considered advantageous, although this would not really be the case. For inferior forms might be far better adapted to the edifying of an ignorant congregation. But in any case no such ideally perfect liturgy exists.

The question, therefore, has to be considered, whether the co-existence of various liturgies is detrimental to true unity.³ "Does the concurrent use of the Scottish and the English Office in the Episcopal Church of Scotland break the unity of that Church? Do we feel separated from the Americans because they have a liturgy different from both, but more like the Scottish?" "We have in our own communion already three liturgies, or, if the South African Province finally adopts its revised liturgy, four."

The Bishop accordingly contends that variety may be allowed in India also. "The use in Scotland would be a precedent for India, if India allowed an Eastern liturgy to be used." The Anglican residents, officials, and their families, might retain the Anglican form, while the native Christian might express his devotion in a liturgy of Eastern character. "It should be remembered that the Roman Church of to-day allows its Uniat to retain the use of their Eastern liturgies. Would any Roman really maintain that this breaks the unity of his Communion?"⁴

The Life and Faith of Armenia. (Faith Press). 3s. cloth, 1s. 6d. paper.

In the Armenian Church a priest before ordination must decide, according to the Nicene principle, whether he will marry or be celibate. In the former case he is called *khanana*, and is eligible only for pastoral work; in the latter he is called *vardapet*, which corresponds to archimandrite, is eligible for the higher ranks of the hierarchy, and (e.g., even without episcopal consecration) may exercise episcopal jurisdiction.

The Armenian *vardapet* for England, Dr. Abel Abrahamian, who until recently resided in France and Switzerland, was a conspicuous figure in the Procession at St Paul's on December 16, 1919, and is known to many of us as the author of a very able German treatise on his Church. He now appeals to the wider public of those who, as he puts it, are "surprised to learn that the Armenians are Christians," with a very simple and interesting little handbook, "*The Life and Faith of Armenia*" (Faith Press, Buckingham Street, W.C. 2; 1s. 6d. paper, with 2 illustrations; 3s. cloth, with 8 illustrations), which is just the sort of book that is needed to popularize interest in things Eastern.

Anyone who, for example, has ploughed through the Patriarch Ormanian's

¹ R. 19.

² P. xx.

³ P. xxiii.

⁴ P. xvii.

"Church of Armenia," will be grateful to the vardapet for the skill with which he has made the history of Armenia and its Church a simple story, for the sparing reference to personages and places unknown and strange of sound to English ears, and for his clear exposition of the genius, polity, and doctrinal position of the Armenian Church.

Inter alia we should specially commend attention to what he has to say about Chalcedon; about the democratic nature of Armenian ecclesiastical polity (*e.g.*, bishops cannot be consecrated and priests cannot be ordained unless elected by their future parishioners—women have had votes for ecclesiastical assemblies for centuries, etc.); about the blundering of Protestant missionaries; about the identity of the Armenian Church and nation (the Uniats numbering 3·4 per cent. and the Protestants 1·7 per cent., against the National Church's 95 per cent. of the people), and above all about the reunion of Christendom.

He has, indeed, some very frank things to say about the dealings of other "Apostolic Churches" with the Armenian, but in regard to the English Church he has nothing but what is kind. In fact, he declares plainly that the Armenian Church is eager for inter-communion with us.

Dr. Abel Abrahamian's book will be welcomed by a wide public.

Links in the Chain of Russian Church History. By W. H. Frere, Priest of the Community of the Resurrection. (Faith Press. 1918.)

The description of the characteristics of Russian religion in this book is so penetrating and admirable that we venture, with the publisher's permission, to reproduce the greater part of it, and would send our readers back to the volume itself for an extremely graphic narrative. Father Frere's knowledge of Russian is exceptional, and gives great additional importance to these chapters of history. But it is the devotional side of the Russian character which is our present concern. Speaking of the religious interests of the Russian, Father Frere writes:

"The liturgical controversies exemplify the fact that his religious interests are mainly centred in the worship. Dogmatic discussion has not the same interest for him. The main duty in church life is faithfulness to the tradition; and the typical individual does not wish to claim the right to have a private opinion of his own. Indeed, on the contrary, he is constitutionally suspicious of himself in all matters of religious judgment. In the sphere of worship, equally, he feels the subjective to be dangerous. Safety lies in clinging on to the objective. Piety, therefore, is expressed by observances rather than by feelings. Religion lives on acts, not sentiments. To such a mind, not only is worship and institutional religion congenial, but it is most congenial when it is most objective.

"So the Russian service is a drama, presented before the worshipper, and participated in by them. What he sees is an open representation of spiritual happenings, and his gaze rests upon it and dwells upon it. What he hears is the representation of heavenly sounds, and he is not stirred interiorly by them so much as held by them exteriorly.

"The great actions have their clear significance: they are part of the drama. The drama may be the liturgy; and if so it symbolizes at every successive point the manifested dealing of God with man, throughout the Incarnation and especially in the Passion. Or it may be some other service, less intrinsically dramatic. But even in that case it is dramatized for the Russian mind. All parts of it, small as well as large, are symbolical, and have their dramatic value at least in that way.

"The worshipper's own contribution to the worship is also objective. A prayer involves a crossing, and a bow at least, if not a prostration. . . . These external actions do not spoil the prayer, nor must they take the place of it. But they mediate it.

"So the Russian is prepared to do anything in church except sit. He will be active, not passive. He does not feel constrained, because he is at home. In church he is in his Father's house and enjoying himself, while all that appeals to the senses from outside—in a full consecration of sight, and hearing, and smell, and touch to holy worship—is bringing him into vital contact with the spiritual world.

"He is at home also because he is in the midst of many generations of the members of his family. He does not have to conjure up the remembrance of them for himself; the walls all around are eloquent reminders of them. The saints look out at him from their high and gleaming ikons as from a blaze of glory, and he pays his respects to them familiarly, but reverently. As he passes along through the ranks of them with a petition and a kiss for each, he is threading his way along an easy and familiar road, till he comes up to the climax—to the Royal Doors in the great screen and the representations of the Apostles, the Forerunner, St. Michael, the Blessed Virgin Mother of God; and so to the Saviour Himself, the Mediator, whose secret place is on the altar-throne, within the veil behind those Doors, but who comes forth from time to time encircled by the heavenly host to manifest Himself, to be sacrificed, and to give Himself to the faithful, and so unite them with the Father by the operation of the Holy Ghost.

"Such things as these the Russian seems to understand instinctively, whether he be the smart officer in a spotless uniform, or the uncouth, picturesque peasant in an old sheepskin who stands cheek by jowl with him, each alike intent on the moving scene.

"He has a very keen sense of the first half of the Decalogue—the part that Anglo-Saxons tend to neglect. Therefore, worship and prayer and confession of sin are to him the very air that he breathes. We may think ourselves better observers of the second half of the Decalogue than he: better used to avoiding certain specific injuries to our neighbour, and to observing some of the more legal forms of moral precept and self-restraint. But if we turn from the Old Covenant to the New, from the Decalogue to the Beatitudes, any self-satisfaction that we may have taken to ourselves from the comparison at once vanishes again. To the Russian Orthodox mind poverty, meekness, compassion, mercy, and the other lineaments of the man who is depicted by our Lord as blessed, are in fact the Christian ideals, admired in others and sought by each. The outlook is very different from that of the Anglo-Saxon religious man, by whom they are, to a large extent, neither admired nor coveted."

Yet at the same time Father Frere points out that "strangely enough the Russian's love of the objective act does not lead him to frequency of communion. He is a communicant; he has been so ever since his baptism, and there is no large class of non-communicant adherents; but he communicates only at rare intervals. Frequent communion has never been part of the Russian tradition, not even among the monks and nuns. Attendance at the liturgy is part of the tradition; so it is celebrated on Sundays and festivals, and never without all the fullest possible ceremony and solemnity."

That, then, is the Russian traditional Christian devotion. Father Frere goes on to lay stress on the power and the limitation of this tradition.

"The power of such a tradition filling the air which the average Russian breathes from the cradle to the grave is very prevailing; but it is not all-dominant. If so be that the tradition fails, religion itself seems to go. So a whole class in Russia, not large indeed in numbers, but important through education and influence, has deserted the tradition, and fallen wholly out of touch with religion. For such people as these mere religious instinct and tradition are not enough. They are people who must think and reason: and they have rebelled against a tradition of belief and practice which seemed to discourage thinking, and to be afraid of reason. Throughout Russia there is a certain solid and fundamental measure of Christian doctrine which is taught in the schools, and still more in the homes. The effect of it up to a certain point seems to permeate the national atmosphere, and to

be imbibed by all. But the man or woman who finds this insufficient and wants more, has in many cases little chance of getting sufficient to satisfy the inquiring mind. Until recently public preaching and more advanced teaching have been rare. There is no general opportunity of public religious education, such as the Anglican preparation for confirmation affords, since all are confirmed immediately after baptism. Nor is there any crucial moment of 'first communion,' for the little children are communicated constantly until they come to years of discretion; and then they drop to the infrequency of communion which prevails among the adults.

"It cannot be denied that the abstention from religion of many in the best educated groups is a very serious menace to the future."¹

Littérature Russe. Par K. Waliszewski. 1918.

Waliszewski is a masterly writer on Russian history. His series of imperial biographies is well known. Ivan the Terrible, Peter the Great, and the last of the Romanoffs all form the theme of separate studies.

The present volume on Russian literature is in its third edition in French; and, like the biographies, has been translated into English. He is eminently readable. His account of Dostoiévski is vivid and graphic to a degree. The book is practically the first critical account of Russian romance accessible to English or French readers. Waliszewski's criticism is chiefly literary, but he is also keenly interested in psychological motives. He says of himself: "Je suis un pauvre docteur en mysticisme." But he enters with the keenest appreciation into Dostoiévski's conception of Christ confronting a Spanish Inquisitor at an *auto-de-fé*. The account which Waliszewski gives of Dostoiévski's personal sufferings under Russian autocracy is tremendous. Altogether the book is very able, and well worth reading.

Leonid Turkevich on Orthodox Devotions.

An interesting account of the Orthodox Church Service from the devotional standpoint by Leonid Turkevich will be found in the *Constructive Quarterly* for September, 1919. Writing on what he calls the spiritual uplift experienced through the Divine services, the author asks: "What is all this? Is it idolatry? idolatry shaped anew, an inheritance of old heathen days, piercing through a crust of Christianity; or rather an endeavour to spiritualize the earth and the best products of earth's thought and handiwork? It is the latter.

"Let me quote a single troparion which is part of a special service celebrated in honour of the Achoropite Image of the Saviour, which the priest about to celebrate the Divine Liturgy must recite before the Image of Christ to the right of the central door in the altar screen: 'We bow to Thy most pure Image, O good God, praying the forgiveness of our sins, O Christ God. Of Thine own Will Thou hast deigned to suffer on the Cross in Thy flesh, so that those Thou hast created may be delivered from the works of the enemy. Therefore we cry gratefully unto Thee: Thou hast filled all with joy, our Saviour, Who didst come to save the world.' Could words like these be applied to colours, or to the painted outlines of the figure of the Saviour, one of them so black with age as to be hardly visible? Most certainly they could not. In memory of the grave of Christ and the greatest miracle of our Saviour performed therein, we sing without the slightest hesitation: 'Rejoice! O life-bearing grave, out of which rose the Resurrected Christ.'

"At the Feast of the Intercession of the Holy Virgin we feel morally uplifted when we pray the Holy Mother: 'Rejoice, O our Joy, protect us from all evil under Thy most precious mantle.' What cause have we therefore to fear reproach, as if we were idol-worshippers, when we bow in reverence when the Gospel is carried past us, or the precious elements are prepared for the administering of the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist?

"In all these instances we are living a double life, half-earthly and half-heavenly and spiritual. This is why our earthly hearts light up with palpitating radiance when the elements are carried before us for the Sacrament. At such moments all the worshippers in the church, or the choir representing them, sing the Cherubim Song of Justinian: 'In mysterious likeness to the Cherubim singing to the life-creating Trinity a thrice holy song, let us lay aside all worldly care and magnify the King of all, invisibly borne on a shield by the hosts of angels. Alleluia, alleluia, alleluia!'"

"At these moments nothing earthly remains to attract the attention of the worshipper: all seems to elevate the spirit of man, to extend beyond the earth, to be heavenly."¹

The Greek Orthodox Church. By the Rev. Constantine Callinicos, Protosphyriar of the Church of the Annunciation in Manchester. (Longmans. 1918.)

An account of the existing state of the Greek Orthodox Church from the pen of a Greek priest resident in England commends itself to the notice of English readers. Sketches are given of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, then of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem; then of the independent Churches of Greece, Cyprus, and Sinai: that venerable monastery whose record extends over fourteen centuries, and whose Abbot is Archbishop, Doctor in Philosophy at Leipzig, and Doctor of Laws of the University of Cambridge. Short chapters on doctrine and worship and organization follow. On organization, Father Callinicos writes that "the fulness of priesthood is found in the bishops, who, as the lawful successors of the Apostles, have inherited from them the power of shepherding souls, conferred in the first instance by our Lord Himself. It is, therefore, Episcopacy which, by its collective and united action, governs the Church, and is the visible head of the body, of which Christ is the invisible Chief" (p. 34). To them the priests and deacons are subordinated. But "the laity are not altogether excluded from the management of Church affairs" (p. 39). "Finance is, as a rule, left to the laity, who alone are responsible for the erection and upkeep of churches, the maintenance of schools, the payment of salaries, and the like" (p. 40).

But in our opinion the most interesting chapters are the last two. On the present state of the Greek Church, we read that "the state of the Greek parochial clergy was till recently very bad. The bishops alone enjoyed financial independence and some measure of culture. Priests and deacons had no regular salary, and were barely able to live on their scanty perquisites. Destitute, moreover, as they were of any scientific equipment for their work, they shared their time between the plough and the mechanical performance of the services of the Church. Great trouble has, however, been taken of late years for the amelioration of their lot, and it has already begun to bear the desired fruit" (p. 42). "Since Meletius Metaxakis became Metropolitan of Athens the standard has been raised, and no candidate is admitted unless he has a degree of an acknowledged theological school or a seminary at least" (p. 44). Further than that "a great number of Greek bishops to-day have also taken special courses in European universities, especially in Germany" (p. 45).

Father Callinicos' view on the relation between Orthodoxy and Anglicanism is that they "possess many common points. Both are national Churches which have felt the hostility of Romanism. Both have kept the institution of Episcopacy undamaged, and pay honour to the primitive undivided Catholic Church, without overlooking the new problems of to-day. Both stand together midway between Papal Absolutism and Protestant Rationalism." "And if there are differences between them, these are gifts differing according to grace, adding one more reason for their coming together that the one's abundance may be a supply for the other's need" (pp. 58, 59).

¹ Pp. 506, 507.

Intercommunion with the Assyrian Church, by Dr. W. A. Wigram (6d.); and *The English and Armenian Churches*, by the Rev. Harold Buxton. (Faith Press.) 6d.

It will be remembered that at the last Lambeth Conference recommendations were made, largely at the instance of Bishop Collins of Gibraltar, that if and when the Assyrians and Armenians affirmed the Christological clauses of the Athanasian Creed, the Archbishop of Canterbury should authorize their being given communion in emergency and on ceremonial occasions. Dr. Wigram and Mr. Buxton, both of whom have special and first-hand knowledge respectively of the present position in regard to the Assyrians and Armenians, explain the present position. The former leaves no doubt that if the recommendation is repeated in July at Lambeth the Assyrians will be ready to accept the proffered privilege. Mr. Buxton is of opinion that the time is not ripe for more than an *entente* with the Armenians. Both pamphlets are a contribution alike to the study of these Churches and to the problem of reunion.

EASTERN CHURCHES COMMITTEE

(APPOINTED BY THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY)

Chairman:

Bishop Gore, 6, Margaret Street, W.

Bishop of Gloucester, Palace, Gloucester.

Bishop of London, Fulham Palace, S.W.

Bishop of Truro, Lis Escop, Truro.

Bishop of Moray and Ross and Caithness, Eden Court, Inverness.

Bishop of Gibraltar, 23, Old Park Road, Hitchin.

Bishop Bury, 8, Greycoat Gardens, S.W. 1.

Bishop Robertson, 7, Canterbury Road, Oxford.

Most Rev. Dr. Bernard, Provost's House, Trinity College, Dublin.

Most Rev. H. Lowther-Clarke, D.D. (Archbishop of Melbourne), All Saints Vicarage,

Pratt Street, Camden Town, N.W.

Rev. F. E. Brightman, Magdalen College, Oxford.

Rev. W. H. Frere, House of the Resurrection, Mirfield, Yorks.

Rev. A. C. Headlam, Christ Church, Oxford.

Rev. H. J. White, 230, St. James's Court, S.W. 1.

Rev. W. A. Wigram, Watling House, St. Albans.

Rev. Dr. Sparrow Simpson, St. Mary's Hospital, Ilford, Essex.

Rev. G. K. A. Bell, Lambeth Palace, S.E. 1.

Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, S.P.C.K., 6, St. Martin's Place, W.C. 2.

Rev. J. A. Douglas, 11, Commercial Road, S.E. 15.

Rev. R. French, 16, Parks Road, Oxford.

Rev. F. N. Heazell, St. Michael's, West Croydon.

Rev. R. Laffan, Queen's College, Cambridge.

Rev. Dr. Margoliouth, 88, Woodstock Road, Oxford.

Rev. L. Pullan, St. John's College, Oxford.

Rev. F. W. Puller, Mission House, Cowley St. John, Oxford.

Rev. R. F. MacNeile, Redgate, Uppingham.

Professor Burkitt, Westroad Corner, Cambridge.

Lord Hugh Cecil, 20, Arlington Street, S.W. 1.

Sir Samuel Hoare, Bart., M.P., 16, Cadogan Gardens, S.W. 3.

A. Riley, Esq., 2, Kensington Court, W. 8.

S. Gazelee, Esq., Foreign Office, Whitehall, S.W. 1.

R. F. Young, Esq., Devonshire Club, S.W. 1.

General Secretary:

Rev. H. J. Fynes-Clinton, 27, Finsbury Square, E.C. 2.



THE ENGLISH AND EASTERN ASSOCIATION